

INDEXED
X
300
TERMS \$2.50 a year, in advance.



THE

519126

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

V. 41.
(1411)

VOL. XII-NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1911.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1911

*DA

CONTENTS.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE TOILER.....	1
BY EDWIN HEYL DELL, D.D.	
II. THE ANTITHESIS OF ROMANISM AND LUTHERAN- ISM	15
BY REV. ARTHUR H. SMITH, D.D.	
III. DR. ELIOT'S 'RELIGION OF THE FUTURE'.....	30
BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.	
IV. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEPARTED SOULS. . .	53
BY REV. FRED. S. GEESEY.	
V. GLIMPSES OF EARLY LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.....	61
BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D.	
VI. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SACRA- MENTS	74
BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.	
VII. THE LUTHERAN USAGE OF LENT.....	84
BY E. E. ORTLEPP, D.D.	
VIII. CHARGE TO PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.....	117
BY JACOB HENRY CULLER, D.D.	
THE FORMULATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD'S CONFESSIONAL BASIS	120
BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.	
IX. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT	140
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WERTZ, A.M.	
X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....	152
The Person of Christ—The Word for God in Chinese—The Science of Poetry and the Philosophy of Language—Logic and Imagination in the Perception of Truth—The Development of Religion—The Re- ligions of Eastern Asia—The Eisenach Gospel Selections—Lutheran Annual 1911—Beitrage zur praktischen Behandlung der Biblischen Geschichte—World Missionary Conference 1910—The Song of Songs —Social Ministry—The Lesson Handbook 1911—The Political Theo- ries of Martin Luther—Problems of Your Generation—National Perils and Hopes—World Corporation—Catacombs of Worldly Suc- cess or History of Coarseller Dell.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHURCH AND THE TOILER.

BY EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

Jesus Christ was a working man. He toiled with His hands the greater part of His earthly life. "Is not this the carpenter?" was a question implying an undisputed fact in the life of our Lord. His simple life was lived in poverty—an honorable poverty which cherished the refinements of Hebrew character and habits. After years of toil, He said, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." To forget that Jesus through so many years was a manual laborer is to forget an important note in the understanding of His Gospel first preached to peasant-farmers, fishermen and artizans of Galilee. This fact should dignify all labor and assure every common laborer of the possibility of securing and cherishing the highest type of spiritual experience in the midst of a life of toil.

Christianity in its initial form was a Gospel to the poor. The variant report by Luke of the ~~parables~~ ^{parables} makes clear that not the "poor in spirit," but the "poor," were the first recipients of the blessings of grace. Whenever Christianity has been true to its founder, there the poor have received the ~~main~~ ^{main} consideration of the Church. That "the poor have the Gospel preached to them" was one of the marks designated by Christ of the advent of the kingdom of God. All through the Galilean and Judean ministry of Jesus and marking also the growth of the Apostolic Church, we find that the rank and file of the disciples were

drawn not from the mighty but the lowly. The genesis of Christianity is in its sympathy with and aid of the poor, the struggling, the disinherited, the despised classes in society. It is not a class religion it is true. Its appeal is to a common and essential manhood irrespective of wealth, condition or title but its dominant sympathy and purpose is the saving of men plus the amelioration of poverty, disease and disability. Some German writers have sought to prove that Christianity was largely an economic movement and that Jesus was the great labor leader of His day. This distorted and half-baked theory of Christianity must not deter us from seeing the measure of truth in the contention that Jesus' sympathy went out mainly to the great body of the common people who were "like sheep without a shepherd." Much of the later battles over theological definition, Church organization and princely control of provinces were far away in purpose and spirit from the Gospel of Christ. When the Church is primarily concerned with theology, and rites and orders, she has lost her position, glory, and is running after means rather than pursuing and practicing a genuine Christianity. In an earlier paper on "The Modern Church and the Social Crisis," I have traced historically the facts diverting the Church from her central purpose; here I but state the fact that on the earthly side of his mission those who are in distress and want of every kind should be the first consideration of His leaders.

A survey of the history of the laboring classes is a *sine qua non* for an appreciation of what still remains for the Church to do for the toiler in our modern industrial life. It would be impossible in the compass of such a paper to offer even an outline of such a history. The work of such economists as Thorold Rodgers presenting the various forms of slave and feudal labor relations, and Dr. Richard T. Ely's *The Labor Movement in America* furnishes the background for our present problems. Here we can but recall that there has been a gradual advance in the better conditions and wages paid to the toilers on farms, in mines and in factories. In the general advance of wages and the conditions of living it is easy for us to lose sight of the fact that in some spheres of labor the working man has not profited. The rise of trades' unionism has materially benefitted all those within these organized classes but among women, children and men whose lack of infor-

mation and isolated labor are obstacles to united action, the situation demands the serious consideration and help of the Church. One instance is typical. Some time ago I met an old schoolmate who had nearly wrecked his body and mind in the management of a great manufacturing plant. I asked him why he had brought on such a pathetic physical condition. He told me he was expected to hand over annually to the employing firm \$50,000 in clear profits. Later I learned how such a profit was secured by his company. Girls were hired at \$1.50 per week, as an initial wage, and the greatest wage that they could aspire to in the factory was \$4.00 per week. How any girl or woman in a modern city can support herself in health, appearance, and morals on such niggardly wages is a problem beyond my comprehension. The factory is daily pointed out to tourists as a modern wonder of enterprise and management but to one who knows the basis upon which such establishments succeed one is tempted to say that such success is wicked and destructive of all the higher and better life of society. The influx of a large foreign population unable to speak English, ignorant of our laws protecting employees, isolated from intelligent leadership, fearing to migrate from their present place of employment, and dominated by heartless superintendents whose sole aim is to turn out the most work at the smallest expenditure of time and money, presents a special phase of the labor problem which is a challenge to the Church. Such establishments are modern plantations of slaves whose dumb and helpless victims need the voice and pen of men who can reach the public ear and secure for their weaker brothers the consideration which will make healthful labor, rest and recreation possible.

The labor problem would not be banished by the disruption of the labor unions. Those who imagine that strikes and lock-outs are the results primarily of labor organizations are far off the mark. The labor problem is a much wider and deeper question than that of organized labor. There is a general movement toward social and industrial democracy which sweeps onward whether unions do or do not ride on the tide of greater social and economic privilege. No doubt the organization of labor is partly responsible for the general unrest and demand for higher wages and shorter hours of labor, but it is a wider diffusion of knowledge, a clearer idea of how vast fortunes are accu-

mulated, the rise of the price of food stuffs, the craving for some voice in the determination of how the masses shall labor which are the underlying incentives to demand a betterment of conditions.

There are two common fallacies in the industrial world which we may as well face and answer before the Church can be of any real aid to the day laborer and artizan. The first is a fallacy of the ordinary employer of labor—especially the great corporations. It is usually phrased, "Can't a man run his own business to suit himself?" To this claim of absolute control there is but one true answer and that is, No! The denial is easily demonstrable. At every turn the owner and manager of a mill or plant has to conform to certain municipal or State laws concerning building, fire-protection, sanitation, child-labor, protection of life and limb from dangerous machinery, and hours of labor. Further, where the labor is organized, the scale of wages and conditions under which work is accomplished are modified. Many corporations on their own initiative, have sought to better the physical conditions of labor, and some have provided schemes of financial and social betterment, but no man or group of men can conduct their enterprise "just as they please" unless they please to be just and do the honest thing. The great public service corporations have a public to please as well as themselves and it is useless for the capitalist or manager of corporations to be defiant and claim absolute control over their interests. Theoretically the claim "to run one's business as he pleases," sounds quite just and heroic but actually it is autocratic and impossible in modern industrial life.

The other fallacy is held by some men and labor unions. It is this, that labor is the more important partner in every manufacturing or common carrying company, and therefore, has an equal, if not a superior, right with capital, in determining the conditions of labor, the wages paid the employees, and the method of carrying on the business. This usurpation of prerogative is the complement of the equally false assumption of the autocratic management of labor. It is around these antagonistic conditions that the real battle is being fought to-day. Mr. Henry White of the National Civic Federation thus states the situation: "The labor problem in other words, simmers down to a fight over control and the rights asserted by capitalists and

laborer are such as would justify their positions. With the employer the fight is to retain the unrestricted mastery of his business and with the union to restrict it. Ostensibly better pay and treatment are the immediate objects of labor combinations, but in reality the power to dictate working conditions is the underlying and the first object sought. To this end the influence of the leaders is directed, and often against the desire of the rank and file, who are looking for immediate concessions in pay."

Upon the legitimacy of workmen to organize and bargain collectively for wages there is now little difference of opinion among economists and a disinterested public. President Taft in a recent speech before the railroad men fairly voices the attitude of the modern industrial student.

"I believe in labor organizations, and if I were skilled enough to become a member I should apply for membership. The fact is, I believe, I am an honorary member of the Steam Shovelers' Union. But in spite of that, and in spite of my sympathy with organized labor, I put above them, above everything, the right of every man to labor as he will, to earn the wages that he will, and, if he chooses, to stay out of labor organizations. That is the standpoint that the President of the United States must occupy in doing equality to every citizen of the United States.

"Now, the reason why I am in favor of organized labor is that labor must organize to be on an equality with its employers and the capital that its employers have. It has shown in the past that by such organization and by proper methods it can secure the wages to which it is entitled. It can secure an increase when the market is going up and earnings are increasing, and it can prevent the too hasty reduction when earnings are falling off and the business is becoming light.

"It is at the hands of intelligent organization that the cause of labor is to triumph. It is when labor organizations are not guided by intelligence and conservatism that the cause of labor suffers, and with the suffering of labor suffers the entire community."

It is the clash which arises over fundamental control which makes impossible the application of arbitration schemes in many industrial disputes. In a word the problem of elemental rights, as viewed from two conflicting points of view, is the creed of the modern labor problem and it will only be by a patient, intelli-

gent, and just working out of the question of the real, though not legal, partnership, which exists between capital and labor that we dare look for peace. Profit sharing and pension systems are praiseworthy and politic, but they are not the final solution of the labor problem.

It is in the face of this situation that the Church must stand for certain fundamental rights of both employer and employee. The Church does not pose as a judge or economist in the differences between employer and employee, but she should have very clear and definite opinions upon questions of fundamental justice, brotherhood and the plans for the protection and uplift of the toilers in factories, stores, mines and industrial plants.

I know of no better concise statement of the duty of individual churchmen to the toiler than that made by the Committee of the Federal Council of the Church of Christ, in 1908. The recommendations were adopted by the convention and read as follows:

"We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand—

"For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.

"For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind.

"For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

"For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial discussions.

"For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality.

"For the abolition of child-labor.

"For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

"For the suppression of the sweating system.

"For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to be lowered to the lowest practical point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

"For a release from employment one day in seven.

"For a living wage as a minimum in every industry and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

"For the most equitable distribution of the products of industry that can ultimately be desired.

"For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

"For the abatement of poverty."

This program of the Federation will seem sane and worth while to every disinterested student and citizen. It will appear defective and partizan only to the respective champions of labor or capital. But after all it is the third party—the public, in all great industrial disputes which finally determines the justice of a program for industrial betterment.

The remainder of this paper will address itself to a consideration of some of the more important statements in the above suggestions made by the Council.

The first fundamental right in the sphere of industry is that of self-maintenance. The right of a man to work for whom, wherever, and in whatever relation he pleases is a primal right in industrial justice. This proposition is axiomatic. The axiom is disputed, however, by the champions of the so-called "closed shop." In the interest of a class they attack the liberty of the individual. We have always believed that liberty, personal liberty in industry, is more fundamental and sacred than economic success. It must be granted from a purely tactical standpoint that it is better for the toilers as a whole to combine in organizations which are able to bargain collectively for wages and conditions of labor. In fact it seems rather near-sighted in a workman to refuse to join a labor union and secure the advantage of combined effort for class betterment. The spirit and purpose of most labor unions are beneficial for the group represented, but, on the other hand, the surrender of the primal right of self-determination and the liberty of choice is too high a price to pay in some circumstances. There is a tyranny of unionism as well as capitalism which needs rebuke and correction. This theoretical and actual demand for freedom of personal industrial relation must be protected and conserved. The demand for "the closed shop" will always face the counter demand made by employers for "the open shop." Only as workingmen out of a free and full conviction of the righteousness and worth of a

labor union are induced to become members of the association dare the leaders hope to secure the general co-operation of the friends of the toilers. The resort to intimidation and physical violence delays the day when labor will be fully prepared to meet on equal terms the organized forces of capital.

The Church should stand for the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions. "Seek peace and pursue it" is an Apostolic injunction, and Jesus places in the midst of the beatitudes the declaration, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." When conflicts arise between employers and employees involving the comfort, the financial interests, the safety, the lives of the general public, it becomes almost a necessity for constituted political authority, or the leaders of public opinion to intervene in such social warfare. When the dispute is largely a private and restricted affair between individual employers and firms and their operators in factory or plant, the general public has no right in the premises to insist upon conciliation or arbitration. But, in such instances, the whole spirit of Christianity dictates such amicable and mutual consideration of rights and conditions as will lead to peace and good-will between the contending parties. Save when the elemental problem of control is at stake I can think of no situation where employer and employee should not be willing to confer with each other. The irritation which has arisen over dealing with union representatives whether employed or not employed by the particular firm or company does not seem to me a valid cause for refusal to consider the settlement of industrial difficulties. In the case of well organized and directed labor unions such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and in a number of others a far more intelligent and lasting agreement can be reached through labor leaders, than with individual men. Mr. Seth Low, one of our greatest publicists, has made clear the logic of the situation in a speech made before the Contemporary Club of Philadelphia. He said:

"Please note my words carefully. I am not saying that everything which employes as a body ask for is therefore to be granted. I am simply emphasizing their right to conference; and, in the case of union men, to the recognition thus far of their union. Strikes no doubt will take place because of disagreement on the merits, even after such conferences are held; but a strike upon

the merits of a dispute settles something. So does an arbitration upon the merits; but a refusal to confer settles nothing."

In respect to those corporations which involve the health, the happiness, the very life of a community—what we now call public service corporations the public have an undoubted right to insist upon conciliation and arbitration. The refusal of such a semi-public corporation to consider the grievances of its employees whether through representatives of labor unions or not is unreasonable and will not be tolerated for long by an annoyed and suffering public. Mr. Low, in considering the strike and lockout of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, further said:

"I have already made it clear that I think the car company was at fault, in the first instance, in declining arbitration; for when parties equally concerned cannot agree upon the merits, that is the natural and civilized way of reaching a working agreement. A corporation in which the stockholders claim for themselves all the privileges of combined action through their chosen officials occupies a weak position when it denies the same privileges to the laborers whom it employs; and a public service corporation which does this, is, in my judgment, often deliberately inviting trouble, because it is attempting to administer its affairs precisely as though stockholders have rights which laborers do not have.

"I do not think that the argument is conclusive that a public service corporation must be free to conduct its affairs as it pleases, because it is owned as private property. The abstract right of private property is everywhere subject to limitations in the public interest."

Any man whether he be layman or clergyman who proposes or attempts to offer his opinion to either party to such a dispute—especially the party who knows its side is weak—will probably be told that "there is nothing to arbitrate" and courteously advised "to mind his own business." Nevertheless the situation remains unchanged and the obligation to insist upon a peaceful settlement of such disputes is obvious to all disinterested parties. It will not be long before such belligerents will be brought together by either voluntary or enforced arbitration. The history of the New Zealand Experiment and The Canadian Law against

strikes justifies our own State legislatures in formulating some effective means of arbitrating disputes in the labor world.

It is the further duty of the Church to press for the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality. Important as these preventive measures are they can not be discussed in this paper. It is a pathetic fact that there are some occupations in which the average life of the men engaged is from six to eight years. The child-labor problem is now receiving more attention than ever. The cupidity of parents and the indifferent enforcement of existing laws still make possible the employment of children whose bodies and brains are starved by lack of pure air, exercise and school-life. But this crying evil must not be considered in this short hour. Women especially need the aid required to secure the proper hygienic safeguards and moral health so often jeopardized in factory conditions and regulations. The "sweating system," which is a menace to public health and the advance of the laborer, calls for nothing short of suppression. In a number of occupations shorter hours must be secured if there is to be that leisure without which there can never be a true preparation for domestic, social and political life. At least one day in seven—for rest and recreation—preferably Sunday—must be fought for wherever it may be denied. This contention should receive the strongest support of the Church. It is better to impair industry than to brutalize men. Proper management can arrange a release one day in seven from any form of toil. A recent writer in speaking of the action of the United States Steel Corporation looking to the gradual abolition of Sunday labor in their plant said:

"So, too, looked at from the purely business point of view, the management is now persuaded that the setting apart of Sunday as a complete day of rest for the operatives is, aside from moral and civic considerations, a sound policy. Of course, with its great plants and furnaces that must be kept alive, it is essential that there be some Sunday employment but it is believed to be possible to regulate this employment so that those who, by reason of the need of caring for the plants, are obliged to work on Sunday, may have their day of rest, working only six days out of seven. If there be moral influence and domestic associations which prevent the turning of Sunday into a day of dissi-

pation, great or small—and that is the modern tendency with respect to Sunday—then there will follow greater energy and higher productivity on the part of the employes. That is to say, it has been demonstrated that skilled artisans, whose habits are good, are able to do a larger amount of effective work in six days than they would be able to do if they were employed seven days in the week.”

It is to the fundamental problem of a just division of the products of labor that the mind of the Church should in the main be directed. It is not proposed that churchmen should take up a question like a wage-scale or champion the particular prices paid for labor. This would be in violation of common sense and the principle enunciated by Christ “Who made me a judge or divider over you.” But the plea for a living wage as a minimum in every industry and for the highest wage that each industry can afford—these claims are within the circle of justice and humanity. No two localities may be alike as to the cost of living and cost of travel to and from points of labor. What may be a living wage in a country town may be pitifully inadequate to keep a family in a large city. But the principle of the living wage is one for which the laborer must contend and the Church support. Where employers are influenced by the Christian spirit they go a step further and on their own initiative advance wages whenever and wherever the situation justifies it. The problem of wages bases itself not only on the law of supply and demand, but upon considerateness and generous treatment. Some months ago, John Mitchell spoke at Yale and said: “If I were asked to propose a solution of the whole industrial life, I should unhesitatingly advise a literal application of the Golden Rule. Not for one moment would I have the employer imagine that the rate of wages is based upon good-will or a desire to see the condition of labor uplifted. The basal fact determining the fund from which labor’s compensation is drawn is the decrease or increase of the creative capacity and product of the laborer. Only as the capacity and the output of the laborer increases can the most just and generous of employers raise wages permanently. But it is possible to increase the wage-fund and to withhold the possible and rightful wage. There is where the Golden Rule comes into play. It is infinitely better to apply the law of love than to apply the strike or lockout. Among the many

revelations made to the management of the United States Steel Corporation is one which has taught a new view of the relation of employes to the company. The fundamental philosophy of the United States Steel Corporation is the economic principle of securing the largest production of the highest quality at the lowest cost. And it has been demonstrated to the corporation's satisfaction that one element in gaining high production together with high quality and low cost is the payment of satisfactory and therefore adequate wages and salaries to employes. It seems almost paradoxical, yet it can be almost demonstrated in dollars and cents, that high wages, provided they are paid for adequate service, do tend to reduce the cost of production. Twenty-five years ago that would have been regarded as a preposterous statement. To-day the management of the steel corporation and of some of the other greater corporations have discovered that adequate wages result in correspondingly adequate production."

Of course there is a mutual obligation in the application of the principle that applies alike to owners of plant and toiler. This labor problem at base is a moral problem. Mr. Mitchell is right in his diagnosis of the industrial situation. It is not so much a matter of mathematics as management, of manners, quite as much as money, of manhood rather than shrewdness and power. If such a spirit as the Golden Rule indicates was operative the remedies proposed by the radical Socialist and philosophic Anarchist would be purely academic. But so long as the immoral concentration of wealth and particularly the peonage system of some great industrial plants are permitted we must expect to face the steady demand for the civic and state ownership of mines, railways, manufacturies and the establishment of some collective industrial and social organization in which family and industrial life are surrendered to the good of the whole. It is because the Church has been so slow and vague in coming to any active participation in social welfare that the toilers have grown hopeless in securing any aid from the Church as a club in this battle for the square deal and social freedom. Bishop Brewster has recently said in the *North American Review*, "The problem that immediately confronts the Church is not to Christianize socialism but to socialize the Christians, until the ideal principles shall be real and ruling prin-

ciples." The millions upon millions of dollars in the Rockefeller futurity fund are a part of the honestly earned but withheld wealth of the company's employees. It may be better for the world as a whole to keep the fund in Standard Oil certificates and spend the interest in charities and relief measures but I can't see that it is quite just or the best thing from the viewpoint of the toilers—even granted that they may be the best paid employes in the world. Only the wise, strong arm of the Federal Government holding in check the predatory wealth of our land can arrest the growth of a wholesale demand for the ownership and control of our producing and distributing agencies. But no law or commission can take the place of the socialized, Christianized individuals in our churches. Money and might so easily blind the eyes of men that even the saints of both sexes often require the wider vision which a sympathetic study of modern industrial conditions demands.

When the Church can not aid in securing arbitration or in obtaining immediate betterment in conditions and wages she may always sustain that attitude of regard and sympathy with the toiler and his sufferings which will bring a sense of hope and brotherhood into our social relations. The Church can stand for the masses as over against the classes. I believe she does in most communities. But there is ample room for her fuller expression of interest and co-operation in the betterment of our industrial life. The Church does not become partizan in extending sympathy to the wage-worker and especially to the unorganized, helpless, ignorant, baffled men and women of our alien population. Intelligence and wealth command the law. It is high time that poverty and ignorance call out the Gospel's forces for its aid and social regeneration.

The pulpit, the pew and the religious press have each an opportunity and a duty in the present crisis. The pulpit must preach the great law of industrial justice and brotherhood. To this end study, sanity of utterance and a brave heart must be combined. The spirit of conciliation and arbitration must be shown to be constant notes in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. The pew, no less than the pulpit, has its part to play in securing a better understanding, between labor and capital, workingmen and employers. The pew must be willing to hear the message of the true prophet of righteousness. Some of the most consci-

ous and unconscious offenders against social and industrial justice sit in our pews. The pew should also invite to its midst the toiler who ventures into the aisles of the church. The ideal congregation is where the rich and the poor meet together and recognize that God is the maker of all. The religious press can make more specific and thorough the education in social duty commenced by the pulpit. Not until this enthusiasm for humanity equals the enthusiasm for God will the Church have been fully equipped to do her full duty towards the toiler.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

THE ANTITHESIS OF ROMANISM AND LUTHERANISM.

BY REV. ARTHUR H. SMITH, D.D.

It is a mark of the popular mind at the present day to pay little attention to denominational distinctions. Old religious issues are forgotten, and most men have the haziest notions of the principles which have formed the sharp lines of demarkation between great Christian communions. Few even have distinct conceptions of the vital differences between the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, and the Protestant or Evangelical Churches on the other, especially as the latter are represented in the Lutheran Church. The popular mind is beclouded as to denominational distinctions, and its attitude is that of indifference. By many this condition is hailed as a good sign of growing Christian unity and good-will. However, it may be justly questioned whether this is a favorable sign, if it means, as we think it does, weakness of religious convictions, flabbiness of thought, indifference to doctrine, laxity in life, and failure to give loyal and specific service to Christ and the Church. Notwithstanding that the spirit of Christian unity is something to be desired, yet, believing that we should never forget the reasons for the faith that is in us, we desire to consider the "Antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism."

By Romanism we mean the Roman Catholic Church in the specific sense of the papal and hierarchical system, which took possession of the true Catholic Church of Christ. The latter is divine and originated with the Apostles and with Christ; the former is human and arose in the 6th and 7th centuries after Christ, becoming corrupted by many abuses and departures from evangelical faith and doctrine. By Lutheranism we mean the specific evangelical Church and doctrinal system which arose in the 16th century out of the Reformation work of Luther, and which took his name. It was a protest against, and a liberation from the abominations and errors of the Papacy, and a return to the Apostolic teaching, ministry, sacraments, and church-life.

(Seiss-Eccl. Luth. 33). The word "antithesis" means opposition or contrast. Therefore, we speak of the opposition or contrast of these two systems, the Lutheran and Roman Catholic Churches. This antithesis is three-fold, appearing in doctrine, in life, and in spirit.

I. THE ANTITHESIS IN DOCTRINE.

We cannot better pursue this portion of our investigation than by following in a general way, the guidance of the Augsburg Confession, that matchless declaration, which we as Lutherans are proud to present as the confession of our faith. But first let us remark, the Lutheran Church is a conservative Church and the Lutheran Reformation was a conservative reformation. The radicalism was found in other reformation movements of that era. It is a very mistaken conception of Luther which many have formed, picturing him as an iconoclastic radical, raging up and down Germany, like a giant Thor of Teutonic mythology, striking sledge-hammer blows to the destruction of whatever happened to be in his path. Luther was a vigorous polemist and a dangerous adversary, but he was no radical. He was a conservative reformer, with a measure of caution for which most people do not give him credit, clear-eyed to see the truth and the good in Romanism, and purposing to cast off only that which was evil. He progressed unswervingly but slowly. When the radical Carlstadt and the fanatical Zwickau prophets had thrown Wittenberg into sore confusion while Luther was in the Wartburg, it was the great reformer who hastened from his retreat to Wittenberg, restored order, drove out the fanatics, and silenced Carlstadt, by his eight splendid sermons. Of this occasion Prof. Schaff has said that "eloquence rarely achieved a more complete and honorable triumph." There he appeared in his true character, a conservative reformer. As was Luther so is the Church which bears his name, not afraid to declare the doctrines in which there is agreement with Rome, and not hesitating to oppose Rome where they differ vitally.

Returning now to the Augsburg Confession, we note that there are numerous points in which it agrees with the Roman and the Greek Churches,—the confessedly catholic or universal Christian articles. Among these are Article I, of God and the

Trinity; Art. 3, of the Incarnation and Christ's mediatorial work; Art. 8, the validity of administration by unworthy ministers; Art. 9, of Baptism and the right of children to it; Art. 14, of Church Government; 16, of Civil Government; 17, of the second coming of Christ, the general resurrection, the eternity of rewards and punishments; 18, of Free Will; 19, of the Cause of Sin. There are several articles which mark the differences of Lutheranism from other evangelical bodies, but with these we now have nothing to do. We are concerned with those which set forth the antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism. (Krauth-Con. Ref'n—254).

The first to which we call attention is Article 7, dealing with the doctrine of the Church:—"They likewise teach that there will always be one holy Church. But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is correctly taught, and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions, that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere observed. As Paul says, "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc. When in the systematic progress of Christian Theology, we reach the doctrine of the Church, we stand at the point where Romanism and Lutheranism begin to diverge. All differences as to Soteriology had their origin in the differences with respect to this doctrine. Going back to the time when the last of the Apostles died, there is raised inevitably the question, "Where is the Apostolate now?" To this Catholicism answers,—and I quote Martensen, (*Dogmatics*, 345),—"It is in the living successors of the Apostles to whom the true tradition is entrusted, in Bishops, Councils, and Pope, who are to be recognized as the representatives and possessors of continual Apostolic inspiration." The Evangelical Church, on the other hand, replies, "That the only full and valid embodiment and expression of the Apostolate is to be found in Holy Scripture, which is the abiding voice of the Apostles in the Church." The former assumes a progressive inspiration continued through all times, considering the development of the Church to be "a quantitative prolongation of the beginning," as "a mechanical and self-progressive development of tradition," in which the divine element is predominant. But

the Lutheran Church traces inspiration back to its very source, and conceives of the Church's history as a free development, guided by the continuous activity of the Holy Spirit through the divinely ordained Means of Grace.

The same antithesis is reached by another phase of the subject. Man's supreme want is truth. (Luthardt "Saving Truths," 214-15). But he demands certainty about truth, otherwise he has no firm ground on which to stand. Where shall he find it? The Catholic Church takes the position that as the Church is the possessor of the truth, it must be infallible in order to give certainty. Quietly ignoring the claims of inspired Scripture as the ground of certainty, it agrees that the Holy Spirit is infallible, and as He continually dwells in the Church, He makes her infallible. But the Church cannot speak through the divergent voices of her many members, but must do so through her supreme representatives, her supreme tribunals. Therefore, there must be a hierarchy which is infallible, which attribute also belongs to the supreme Head, the Pope. Such in briefest form, is the reasoning of Rome, and upon this foundation has she built her magnificent structure. While the Church is a visible society of all baptized persons, who adopt a certain external creed, have the same sacraments, (seven in number), and acknowledge the Pope as their common head, the hierarchy is really the Church, while salvation is communicated by the priesthood. It is a religion of ecclesiastical authority.

Diametrically opposed to this view is that of Lutheranism. The ground of certainty and truth is in the inspired Word of God, not in the traditions of the Church, not in Councils, not in the hierarchy, not in the Pope. But Christ is now and ever the Supreme Head of His Church, and His Word is the supreme and only infallible rule of faith and practice. Both Luther and Melancthon recognized the importance of dogmatic tradition and treated it with the utmost respect and caution, but Luther absolutely and resolutely refused to recognize any final authority for faith, except that of the Sacred Scriptures. This was the formal principle of the Reformation and it is the position of our Lutheran Church to-day. The Lutheran view, moreover, which is Scriptural and evangelical, is that the Church is the "congregation of the saints," its internal life, not its outward form being its essence. It consists in "the invisible fellowship of all those

who are united by the bonds of a true faith, which ideal union is but imperfectly represented by the visible Church, in which the true Gospel is taught and the sacraments are rightly administered." In a general way, the Church is the whole community of believers, representing in its visible united life, the invisible Kingdom of God as announced by Jesus.

It will be observed also that our Church insists upon the distinction between the visible and invisible Church. Rome regards the Church and the Kingdom of God as identical, and these two terms as coterminous and equivalent. It is true, the Church and the Kingdom are closely related, but they are not the same. The Kingdom of God is spiritual and is not visibly organized. The Church is, however, its great product on earth,—as Dr. Valentine says, (*Theology*, Vol. 2:368),—"the visible body of believers in organized fellowship, in the use of the means for personal salvation, the spread of the Gospel, and the conversion of the world. The organization of the Church is one, and the chief, of its historical manifestations." "It was Rome's terrible mistake when it identified its own hierarchical organization as the 'Kingdom of God' upon the earth." Prof. Franz Delitsch has written:—"We acknowledge the distinction of Church and Kingdom of God. The idea of the Kingdom is of larger extent. The final aim of history, according to God's eternal design, is not the accomplishment of the Church, but the divine Kingdom. However these two have neither a different center nor a different focus. Christ is the center of both, for it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell." Gerhardts has said:—"The distinction of the Church into visible and invisible is opposed to the opinion of the Papists, that the Church of Christ is so confined to the Pope of Rome and the prelates who are in regular succession, that whatever they affirm and believe must necessarily be received by all, and that there dare be no dissent from these in any manner upon any pretext." He says further:—"We therefore deny that the Church has been bound to any fixed seat in such a manner as to continue in it, with visible glory, by any perpetual succession." Melancthon says in his *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*, "But the Church is not only the fellowship of outward objects and rites, as other governments, but it is principally a fellowship of faith and the Holy Ghost in hearts. The Christian Church consists not alone in

fellowship of outward signs, but it consists especially in inward communion of eternal blessings in the heart, as of the Holy Ghost, of faith, of the fear and the love of God." We have presented these authorities that the position of the Lutheran Church past and present may be clear.

The effect of the doctrine of the Church held by Rome, is seen, further, in her claims, (1) that the unity of the Church is to be secured by uniformity in organization and usage; (2), that she possesses a monopoly of saving grace, there being no salvation outside the true Church, namely herself; (3), that the priesthood are a distinct order and are priests in the true sense; (4), and that the Pope is the successor of Peter and the vicar of Christ on earth. On the contrary, the Lutheran Church holds, (1), that the unity of the Church is a matter not of outward form or organization, but of faith and doctrines; (2), that salvation is to be found in every Christian Church that possesses and properly administers the means of grace; (3), that all believers are a spiritual priesthood and that the clergy are ministers of the Word, not priests; (4), that there is no assured Apostolic succession in the Papacy, and that the Holy Spirit alone is the vicar of Christ.

The opposition of Romanism and Lutheranism appears also in their differing attitudes as to the notes of the Church,—the signs by which the visible Church is distinguished. The Lutheran Church takes the position in the 7th Article of the Confession, that these notes are the pure teaching of the Word or the Gospel, and the right administration of the sacraments. The test of the Church in every age is agreement in doctrine, and not in matters secondary or non-essential. This was the position held by the reformers. Luther says:—"Where God's Word is purely taught, there is also the upright and true Church"; while the Augsburg Confession describes the Church as the congregation or fellowship of the saints, "in which the Gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments properly administered." Thus is the Church distinguished and recognized;—in the possession and dispensation of the Means of Grace. But now what is meant by these notes? Certainly we ought to admit that the Word of God is "rightly taught" when it is presented plainly as it stands, without omitting any of its doctrines or making unwarranted additions to what is in the sacred Book; without perversion or

distortion of its plain teachings. Here we take issue with the Catholic Church, which claims the equality if not the superiority of tradition, and the superior right of the supreme tribunals of the Church to interpret Scripture. Therefore Romanism has been guilty of many perversions, suppressions, and additions with reference to the Word. She has sought to keep the Bible from the people, in order to maintain the supremacy of the hierarchy by the agency of popular ignorance; she has taught just as much of the Gospel as she considered consistent with her own claims; she has concealed some of the essential truths of the Gospel message of salvation; and has read into the Bible some things which are not there, such as salvation by good works, worship of the Virgin Mary, the invocation of the saints, and purgatory. The true Church will certainly be distinguished by the teaching of the Word according to its plain and sensible meaning and wording.

This test Lutheranism meets, holding that the Word of God should be accepted without addition or subtraction, as the supreme and normative authority in all matters of religion. It recognizes the value of tradition but denies its authority in the presence of the Scriptures. It holds that the latter should interpret themselves and that every man has the right to read the Bible for himself and to seek the message of the Gospel for himself. It is the principle of freedom of religious thought, and it is right.

As to the "right administration of the sacraments," certainly they ought to be administered as ordained and not changed or withheld in whole or in part. The papal system offends here with reference to the Lord's Supper by withholding one element from the laity and reading into it the sacrifice of the Mass. Our Church takes the ground that the sacraments are rightly administered when in accordance with the plain words of institution and with a proper recognition of the Savior's words, especially in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper,—*"this is my body,"* and *"this is the new testament in my blood."* She teaches the real presence of the glorified body and blood of Christ in the elements, opposing positively the Roman teaching of transubstantiation. The bread and wine remain such, while, in the words of the 10th Article of the Confession, *"In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and*

are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove those who teach otherwise."

We now come to another point of wide divergence between Romanism and our own evangelical faith,—the vital doctrine of justification. The Roman Catholic view grew up logically out of their extreme view of the Church and their superior but unwarranted emphasis upon her authority. It taught and now teaches, at least in practice, that good works are first necessary to forgiveness and salvation,—good works being essentially obedience to the authority and requirements of the Church, humble submission to the hierarchy, penances, observance of rites and ceremonies, etc. The Catholic Church professes to accept a doctrine of justification by faith, but in actual working practice the Catholic believer is led invariably to expect his salvation as grounded in his merits secured by his obedience and good works. The mediatorial work of Christ is pushed into the background. Our opposite Lutheran position is stated clearly in Article 4 of the Augsburg Confession:—"They in like manner teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works; but that they are justified gratuitously for Christ's sake, through faith; when they believe, that they are received in favor, and that their sins are remitted for the sake of Christ, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him." (See Romans 3 and 4). Also in the 6th Article, "concerning new obedience," it is declared that our good works are to be performed because it is God's will, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before Him. For remission of sins and justification are secured by faith; as the declaration of Christ testifies: "When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants." Again in Article 20, "of good works," the position is taken strongly, that while good works are necessary, they "cannot reconcile God, or merit the remission of sins, and grace, and justification." But "being justified by faith we have peace with God."

D'Aubigne, the historian says:—"The Church had fallen because the great doctrine of justification through faith in Christ had been lost. It was therefore, necessary that this doctrine should be restored to her, before she could arise. Whenever this fundamental truth should be restored, all the errors and devices

which had usurped its place, the train of saints, works, penances, masses, and indulgences, would vanish. The moment the one Mediator and his one sacrifice are acknowledged, all other mediators and all other sacrifices disappear." (Vol. I:69). The remedy was plain and Luther, in the Providence of God, was led to it, and preaching the great truth of justification by faith in Christ, he sought to awake and raise Christendom to a new evangelical life. "It is that," said he, "which forms the Church, nourishes it, builds it up, preserves and defends it. No one can rightly teach in the Church, or successfully resist its adversary, if he be wanting in attachment to this grand truth."

Our position is this, that salvation is to be found in faith alone, i. e., "in the surrender of the whole spirit to Christ while the ordinances of the Church and all kinds of works are profitable only so far as they proceed from faith." (Hase). Such is our grand but simple system of faith, declared as we have seen in the Augustana, and outlined at length in our subordinate symbols. The Formula of Concord says:—"We reject and condemn the following modes of speaking, viz., when it is taught and written that good works are necessary to salvation. Also that no one ever has been saved without good works. Also that it is impossible without good works to be saved." Again it declares:—"We believe, teach, and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, and thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God, for the sake of which this faith is imputed to us for righteousness." (Rom. 4:5). Also that "God forgives us for our sins out of pure grace without any work, merit, or worthiness of ours preceding, attending or following." These entire sections ought to be quoted but they are too long. However they should be given careful study. This doctrine of justification by faith was the material principle of the Reformation and is the central doctrine of what is distinctive in the Lutheran system of theology. . . . To the all important question, "What must I do to be saved?" it replies, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Our theology is therefore Christo-centric. It is faith in Christ as our personal Savior, that particularly differentiates Lutheranism from Romanism.

There are other doctrines in which the opposition of the papal and Lutheran systems appear, but we can do little more than

notice them. Especially the Augsburg Confession in Article 2, presents the clear Lutheran view of original sin,—that all men “are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God or confidence towards Him, and with sinful propensities.” It condemns the Pelagianism of Rome whose members “deny that natural depravity is sin, and who, to the disparagement of the glory of Christ’s merits and benefits, contend that man may be justified before God by the powers of his own reason.” The Reformation indeed had its origin in this doctrine, in the deep consciousness of human impotence on account of sin. This led Luther to Christ and justification by faith. The Augustana also presents the Lutheran view of the ministry in Art. 5, as against the priestly conception of Rome; the opposition of Lutheranism in Art. 13, to the “opus operatum” in the sacraments; and to the worship of saints, in Art. 21. In the second part, the Roman views of the Mass, Confession, and human traditions are condemned in Articles 3, 4, and 5.

Leaving now the antithesis in doctrine, let us consider:

II. THE ANTITHESIS IN LIFE.

The life of an individual and the life of a church are the fruits of their faith. The quality of faith determines the quality of character to correspond. It was therefore in the necessity of the case that the life of the Roman Catholic Church should develop along lines parallel to her doctrinal aberrations. Naturally, as she emphasizes more and more the visible Church and her assumed supreme authority in temporal things as well as spiritual, she began to buttress her claims with elaborate and spectacular rites and ceremonies and the assertive claims of priestly character and temporal power, while evangelical truths were concealed. It was also natural that the masses of the people should inevitably grasp and depend upon the externals of religion and miss the spiritual content. This took place with accompanying and growing ignorance, and the lowering of religious and moral standards, until the most terrible crimes and sins were prevalent within the Church unchecked and unrebuked. This is still true except where Catholicism has come in contact with the leaven of Protestantism. We do not mean to say there are no good and pious Christians in the Catholic Church. There are and have

been many such, in spite of the perversions of Romanism. But it is a fact of much significance that in the Middle Ages, men and women of the nobler kind could conceive of a truly religious life only in the monastery, the convent, or the hermit's cave, severed from the world. Asceticism was the natural and extreme recoil of the best minds from the kind of religion exemplified by Rome. But in the secondary reaction the monasteries and convents and monkish orders became hot-beds of luxury and vice. Therefore the Lutheran Church in her symbols has condemned the celibacy of the priesthood as well as the priestly principle, secret confession, monastic vows, the abuse of church power, and human traditions.

The conditions that prevailed in the Middle Ages still are found in large measure wherever Rome has full sway unmodified for good by the leaven of Protestant contact and influence. A man may do or be anything, no matter how evil, so long as he is an obedient servant of the Church. That Rome in its life is little changed, is evidenced by Dr. Francis E. Clark, some time ago, in the *Missionary Review*. He had recently returned from South America and wrote of conditions there. He says:—"The Roman Catholic Church of South America is as different from the same Church in North America as Spain is different from New England. In South America we still find the darkness and corruption of the Middle Ages." "It is admitted even by intelligent Catholics that in South America the Church is decadent and corrupt. The immorality of the priests is taken for granted. Priests' sons and daughters, of course born out of wedlock, abound everywhere, and no stigma attaches to them or to their fathers and mothers." Dr. Clark says that in every large city there are large public orphan asylums where infants are received and no questions asked, and that a considerable percentage are children of priests. Gross superstition is still cultivated assiduously by the Roman Church. It is not surprising that under these conditions in South America, Central America, Mexico, Spain, France, Italy, the Philippines, unbelief and indifference to spiritual things are the rule among the men. The best of them are repelled from religion. Other eminent observers give similar testimony.

It is a very different life that the Lutheran Church has developed. She has emphasized the spiritual side of doctrine and

worship, and has given her people the best possible religious instruction from childhood up by the catechism and the ministry of the Word. She has led the believer directly to Christ and to the Scriptures, while she has shown him the way of true spiritual repentance and faith. While the Roman Church has reserved the public worship for the priests and choirs, Lutheran liturgical orders have put the worship in the hands of the congregation. She has not sought to dazzle the eye but to touch the heart and appeal to the mind. The result is seen in a high and beautiful type of Church life and personal piety, spiritual in character and influence. Luther's own personal life and his home life are fine examples of the fruits of a true evangelical faith. These examples have been duplicated thousands of times in Lutheran homes, in every generation since the Reformation, whose piety has been cheerful, joyous, stable, practical, marked by firmness of convictions, simple-hearted, intelligent faith, kindliness of spirit, and conscientious devotion to duty, while prayer has made the atmosphere out of which it has grown. It is certainly a significant and gratifying fact that Lutheran lands, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the best Lutheran communities in America, have shown the best civilization, most progress in education, purest types of character, the steadiest respect for law, the least amount of crime and vice.

It is true, there have been times of spiritual declension, and Rationalism has laid its chilling touch upon the Church's fervor, and we acknowledge freely that there have been many unworthy people in the Lutheran fold, just as on the other hand we bear witness that there have been many fine examples of Christian piety in the Catholic Church. But the rule holds that the natural fruit of Romanism is externalism in religion, while that of Lutheranism in contrast, is spirituality and elevated ideals. In its broadest aspect, the life of the Lutheran Church, in piety and polity, is free, quickening to the intellect, ennobling and lifting up nearer to God.

III. THE ANTITHESIS IN SPIRIT.

We wish yet to refer just as briefly as we can, to the antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism in spirit. By the spirit of the Church, we mean its formative mental attitude towards human

progress, religious, intellectual, political and social. The spirit of Rome is reactionary, traditional and repressive. That of Lutheranism is progressive, promotive of freedom of thought, (for the right of private judgment was a leading principle of the Reformation), and encouraging to the intellectual pioneer. These two vitally antagonistic mental attitudes of these great systems are clearly the logical and necessary effects of their antithesis first in doctrine and second in life. When Rome in the past, encouraged literature, philosophy, science and art, it was always within a limited scope, whose boundaries were determined by the arbitrary restrictions of the papal hierarchy. There was no freedom of development. In these fields, with the exception of art, progress was always stunted. History cannot forget the heavy hand of Rome laid on Abelard, Bruno, Galileo, Arnold of Brescia, Huss, Savonarola, and many others. It is true that literature flowered beautifully in France in the age of Bossuet, but Bossuet was made a possibility only because then it was the day of the partial triumph of Gallican liberties.

The spirit of Protestantism, of which Lutheranism is the chief representative, has ever encouraged culture, the fine arts and freedom. I need not enlarge on this plain fact of history. I want to quote a few sentences from Macaulay with reference to the contrast of the two systems under consideration. He says: "The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets." "Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Canada remain inert, while the whole continent around them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise." What the historian says of Protestantism applies to Lutheranism, which is its chief representative.

The Lutheran Church, in its true tendency and influence has ever evinced itself as friendly to religious and civil liberty, while it has inspired art and science to reach beyond the restricted limits allowed by the Roman selfish tyranny. The broadening field of philosophy also has been made possible by the quickening impulses given to thought by the former. In short Lutheranism has not failed to discern the true relation of Christianity to culture, perceiving that it is "not to be something apart, but rather a leaven to permeate all things." What Dr. Fisher says of Protestantism in his volume on the Reformation, (464), is true of our own faith and system. "It was a religion of the spirit and liberty. Luther advised monks and nuns to marry, to engage in useful employments, to get from life all reasonable pleasures and to do good in a practical way. Religion is not to divorce itself from science, art, industry, recreation, from anything that promotes the well-being of man on earth; but religion is to leaven all with a higher consecration." Such is the spirit of Lutheranism, neither an Hebrew isolation, nor a pagan self-indulgence, nor a Catholic reactionary strangling of the human intellect and will.

The antithesis in spirit which we have outlined is not a thing of the past, as some might suppose, but a thing of the present, yea, of this very hour. Rome has been accustomed to reiterate her proud boast that she never changes; that the possessor of the keys of St. Peter the one-time mistress of the Seven Hills is always the same. This is nearly true. Certain it is Rome does not change except under the sternest compulsion. Her spirit is unchanged. Witness present conditions at Rome, and especially the encyclical against Modernism, issued by Pius X, explaining and applying his Syllabus, a deliverance which aims at the suppression of research and forbids liberty of thought in teachers and scholars. One leading journal, (*The Independent*), declares it to be "the most ominous event in the history of the Christian Church that has appeared since the declaration of infallibility by the Vatican Council," while a Catholic priest declares that "Pius X has brought in an era of reactionary repressions which is worse than anything of the kind in the memory of living men." The philosopher DesCartes, generations ago, was a Catholic and sought to keep his philosophy within the limits allowed by Rome. Such was his caution, that when he heard that

Galileo had been condemned, he suppressed his own work on "The World," in which he had advocated the Copernican view, and which was ready for the press. And yet, the Cartesian philosophy was denounced by the Sorbonne. (Fisher, Id., 453). To-day, in the twentieth century, Father Tyrrel, thinking too much, saying too much, is crushed and silenced by Rome. Left penniless, he submitted, and the Pope graciously, as one has said, permits him to eat bread. Father Loisy is bolder and holds that no Pope can strangle his free thought. But will he run the risk? Will he submit also?

That was a remarkable address delivered by Abbe Houtin of France before the Congress of Religious Liberals in Boston. He spoke of the liberal elements in the Catholic Church and divided them into three classes, saying that those of the first class seek to remain at peace with Rome; those of the second have practically drifted into Deism, and those of the third class into Atheism, although many of them dare not yet avow their views. That is the spirit of Rome, rule or ruin; crush into submission or drive to the extreme of unbelief. Liberty of thought has its perils and often runs to excesses. These the Lutheran Church never approves, nor can we sympathize with the Congress referred to, but nevertheless, the human mind cannot be crushed and its thought strangled, for progress is born of freedom. It is the duty of the Church to guide wisely, to instruct, to enlighten, to awaken the souls of men to their great spiritual inheritance, but not to usurp the functions of Providence as does Rome. Such is the attitude of Lutheranism. The antithesis is sharp.

But we have said enough as to the contrast of Romanism and Lutheranism in doctrine, life and spirit. The Lutheran Church stands as the advocate of pure evangelical truth, the conservator of piety and a spiritual religion, the promoter of knowledge and education, and the encourager of culture, research and freedom. Therein she is the antithesis of Rome.

Ashland, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

DR. ELIOT'S "RELIGION OF THE FUTURE."

BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.

It is but fair to give the author's own caption to his lecture, which he delivered at the close of last year's Harvard Summer School of Theology, and which has been published in the October (1909) number of the *Harvard Theological Review*. As the corrected and authenticated form of this famous address, which still remains a live wire in our periodical literature, we will take this article, and not any press-report of it, as the basis of some remarks. We shall thus not be in any danger of misquoting it and we will not purposely do an injustice of that kind. Although the whole piece, as a product of thought and a literary composition, reveals haste and frequent inelegance in diction, it must stand as the noted educator's deliberate opinion. By these words he must be willing to stand or fall, and we suppose he is.

However, the chief weight that attaches to this much-discussed deliverance does not consist in the fact that it contains the religious views of Dr. Eliot, but that it is symptomatic of the times. Many of our highly educated and cultured contemporaries hold a similar stand-point. Likely most of the advocates of modern science and philosophy would broadly subscribe to such a creed, if to any at all, and certainly our entire current literature, from the most pretentious magazine down to the most humble patent-outside county paper, is saturated with the liberalistic views of religion. Such is part of the atmosphere of our present-day thought. Not only cannon, but also pop-guns, are being fired against the citadel of divine truth, and the danger is, not that the walls will fall or that the battered gates will yield, but that many of its professed defenders will throw the keys out to the enemy.

The lecture under consideration usually is styled "Dr. Eliot's New Religion." Well is it so labeled, for it certainly is not that of Christianity. It simply is a revamped form of the old Arianism and Socinianism, galvanized by the spirit of modern scientific speculation. It is but an old heresy, taken out of the

morgue of dead faiths and given the semblance of life, by infusing into its corpse some of the energy which true religion has preserved in the world and calling the deceptive recrudescence "new." In the body of his lecture Dr. Eliot himself uses this nomenclature and explains the sense in which he employs it—"not," says he, "that a single one of its doctrines and practices is really new in essence, but only that the wider acceptance and better actual application of truths familiar in the past are new."

In spite of his stumbling effort at division into negative and positive, his composition is loose-jointed, rambling, and prolix, and consequently does not easily yield to analysis. But for our own convenience, and so as to show that we do not reject every line of it, we will first emphasize the points which are approved.

Dr. Eliot believes in the personality of God and the spirituality of man. Over against bald materialism he witnesses a good confession. He also teaches that the universe is controlled by a loving Providence. He is a foe to superstition, to dead religious formalism, and upholds religion, not as a mere profession, but as a life, pleading for a practical sympathy, and helpful altruism among men. Never did pure ethics and right character receive a warmer advocacy. Dr. Eliot in his line has served humanity well and there is much in his address which, if applied, would make the world better. He may not be an optimist, but he certainly is an ameliorist, who has labored and still hopes for betterment in the human race. He thinks he has stated the form of religion which, as a means, would best attain this noble end. In this we deem him to be sincere but mistaken. With all due respect for his honorable career we have no use for his system of religion. It is indeed not new, but during a millennium and a half of history, under ever changing phenomena, it has proven itself incapable of effecting a single reformation, has produced but few martyrs to any good cause, and has ever been the fruitful mother of the very skepticism which it has promised to cure. Where are the Unitarian missionaries, who have planted the cross among the heathen? Where has this cult, which is only an imitation of Christianity, ever sustained itself alone by its own moral and spiritual force? In America it has been a perennial parasite upon orthodoxy and yet it is decaying amidst the denominations upon whose blood it has been feeding. True, it numbers among its adherents some great names, but, as

Mr. Joseph Cook used to say, "a doctrine is not to be judged by the men who profess it, but by the men it makes." Tested by this rule, we are persuaded that this "religion of the future," left to work out its own natural results, will not produce the Christian heroes of the future or do the world a superior amount of good.

In one sentence we find our Professor saying, "Religion is not a fixed, but a fluent thing." In the next sentence he says, "The conceptions of religion prevalent among educated people change from century to century." It is surprising that a reputed scholar should not have discovered that he was here speaking of two widely different topics. The term "religion" and the term "conceptions of religion," though related, are far from being equal factors of the same equation. Yet Dr. Eliot writes as though they were and is not conscious of self-contradiction. That religion itself is a variable thing we deny; that man's "conceptions of religion" are as changeable as a weather-vane, we confess. Every wind of doctrine turns some men's minds to all points of the compass. But true religion, like the pole star, ever shines in the same place in the firmament. Theology may be progressive or otherwise, but the absolute truth, which is its subject, remains a constant quantity. Dr. Eliot, logically, must be driven to the same conclusion, since, in effect, he says that the *essence of religion is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man*. But how could such a foundation be one thing in the first century and altogether another in the twentieth? Man's view-point of that essence may be different from age to age, the emphasis being shifted from time to time, but the great luminary of truth remains the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It always is the bane of rationalism that it either confuses religion itself with the conceptions of religion—the substance with its accidents—or calls the wrong things the accidents. Hence it never considers any conclusion final, but looks upon all things as being in a state of flux and is constantly wandering after *ignes fatui* in the quagmires of scientific and philosophic speculation,—ever groping about in the gloaming for a foothold which it never can feel sure of having found.

The first negative of the religion of the future shall be that it "will not be based on authority, either spiritual or temporal."

If by "temporal" Dr. Eliot means to refer to Roman Catholi-

cism or Christian Science we, of course, agree with him. We believe neither in the power of the Roman See nor in the spiritual monopoly of the Mother Church at Boston. Neither the Pope nor Mrs. Eddy has the right to lord it over private judgment or the individual conscience, in the interpretation of Scripture or the conduct of life. Nevertheless, by denying all authority in religion, one is kindling a fire which, if allowed to blaze into a conflagration, one would be glad to quench, if only it could yet be done. That is the argument of the anarchist, who usually chafes under the restraints of religion, before he kicks against the goads of civil and criminal law. Far better that all the world should be under the Roman Pontiff, rather than under the liberalism of so-called free thought or the rationalism which Dr. Eliot upholds, which finds no higher seat of authority for religion than the human intellect. In this first proposition Francisco Ferrer, whom the Spaniards lately blunderingly elevated to martyrdom as a pedagogic anarchist and atheist, and the ex-President of Harvard are in perfect rapport. Emma Goldman, the American high priestess of the red flag and instructress of Czolgosz, would say "Amen" to it. In declaring that the Reformation substituted an "authoritative book" for an "authoritative church," the highest possible compliment is paid that glorious epoch in history. With his animadversion on verbal inspiration we are not concerned. The Church is not bound to any theory of inspiration, only to the fact. We believe it is plenary and sufficient, and, unless we retain the Bible as our rule of faith and practice, unless we keep its divine oracles as the ultimate criterion of appeal, Christianity as a distinctive religion will disintegrate and disappear from the earth. It will not do to say that it was founded without the New Testament in its written form. Such is the claim of the cheap documentary scholarship, of which we hear too much in our times. It is a plausible argument, but not a real one, for the Church was founded upon the present contents of *The Book* and upon nothing besides. It contains not only the facts, but also the personalities, of its original founders. Afterwards such a record as a norm of truth was felt to be needful as a guide in all difficulties and disputes. Such was the providential origin of the New Testament and without it Christianity, like a magnificent frigate, without helm or compass, can only come to wreck upon the tur-

bulent seas of time. According to the new religion, as well as according to the new pragmatic philosophy, every man is to be a law unto himself. In faith and morals, as well as in civil government, such a condition can end only in confusion. "To the law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them." (Isa. 8:20). Vainly does modernism seek spiritual authority and divine revelation in the human soul and set it up against the external or objective word of Jesus Christ and the sacred canon. This, and not the dry-rot of a fallible subjectivism, must remain Christianity's court of final recourse. Wherever it exists without this divine sanction it already is moribund, as to-day is the case with Unitarianism and all kindred idealisms.

"It is hardly necessary to say that in the religion of the future there will be no personifications of the primitive forces of nature."

In these words Dr. Eliot states his second negation. We readily and thoroughly agree with it at sight.

His third negative, however, is very sweeping and revolutionary. "There will be in the religion of the future," he says, "no worship, express or implied, of dead ancestors, teachers, or rulers; no more tribal, racial, or tutelary gods; no identification of any human being, however majestic in character, with the Eternal Deity."

To a devoted Christian this is blasphemous language. The fact that any cultured gentleman should so insult our holiest feelings by listing the adoration of Jesus Christ with ethnic idolatry and heathen ancestor-worship almost removes him beyond our patience. We are here reminded of Emerson, who had the temerity to mention Jesus and Plato in the same breath. Such classification we indignantly repudiate. Besides, Dr. Eliot manifests an insidious, subtle, yet coarse cowardice, by concealing his attack on the divinity of Christ behind glittering generalities. Why does he not name Him? The reader, anyway knows exactly whom he means by his veiled "human being." In the very next sentence he quotes the saying of Jesus to the Woman of Samaria concerning the spiritual worship of God. The implication of course, is that even He taught that we should worship the Father alone, as though we could be oblivious of the fact that this same Jesus declared that He and the Father are

one and sublimely enough invited all men to come to Himself to obtain satisfaction for the deep needs of the soul. (Matt. 11:25-30; John 10:30; 14:9). In consonance with Harnack, in his "Wesen des Christenthums," Dr. Eliot would have us think that Jesus knew nothing but His Father as an object of adoration, and that He was the Son only in the sense of having a higher knowledge of God. As the testimony of St. John so positively contradicts this standpoint, his is not the favorite gospel of rationalists. Yet he alone records the incident of the Woman at the Well and its lessons. May we infer that Dr. Eliot, by quoting it, considers all of John's gospel genuine and authentic? We fear not.

His argument that patriotism, according to which each side in a war between Christian nations prays to the same God for success, is "the survival of a tribal or national quality in institutional Christianity," plainly is a non-sequitur. It is but another specimen of the innumerable fancies of Darwinism, which should have a Nobel prize for the most monstrous imaginary feats of the century. It is and will remain an instinct of human nature to consider its own side in the right and to think that even God should favor its cause, and no international or cosmopolitan education ever will erase it. It is rooted in the caverns of the sub-conscious soul by nature itself. Religion is not its cause, nor is Christianity its apologist.

But it is evident that the new religion is not Christianity and therefore we hope it will not be that of the future. With the elimination of Christ as the peculiar Son of God and the divine Redeemer, the old religion will disappear from among men. It is not strange that this by no means brief discourse should be silent about the Resurrection of Jesus. Were the Apostolic and primitive heralds of the cross quiet about it? Would they have been so successful in their propagandism, if they had been? But the entire clan of liberalistic and rationalistic religionists ignores this most stupendous fact in historical Christianity. There is to be no Apostles' Creed, no historic Christ, but only an idealized Jesus, who would be no better than an idealized Buddha, Socrates, or an altogether fictitious reformer. How these ethicalists can expect first to rob Christianity of its chief distinctive features and still profess to be its advocates, is a psy-

chological problem which demands solution. Its declared antagonists could not do worse.

"In the religious life of the future the primary object will not be the personal welfare or safety of the individual in this world or any other. That safety, that welfare or salvation, may be incidentally secured, but it will not be the primary object in view. The religious person will not think of his own welfare or security, but of service to others, and of contributions to the common good." By these words the fourth negative is set forth. We can not find anything objectionable in such explicitly altruistic language, but what is new in this sentiment? The unselfishness, which is here inculcated, was from the beginning the teaching of the Gospel and the practice aimed at by the institutional Church. It is the ambient air of Paul's epistle. The man who could be content to be saved himself, without caring for the salvation of others, has always been considered a monster by Christianity. It is the doctrine of the survival of the fittest that crowns such an one the paragon of the race. He is Nietzsche's superman, indulging his unbridled self-interest, treating all others as booty to gain his ends, who alone is considered worth living; but the old religion has always regarded such an incarnation of egotism as a beast. A self-abasing benevolence has been the ideal of evangelical Christianity. The redemption of the entire race, the care of the unfortunate and the succor of the poor, is the ardent dream of the Church. To leave the world better than we found it, to be a blessing to our neighbors, is to-day the highest ethical standard for a true believer. To be a man among men for mutual helpfulness, not the useless existence of the anchorite, is held to be the normal life of a saint. To spend and to be spent, to lose one's self in sacrifice for one's fellows is, and always has been, the prime purpose of Christian consecration, of which the gigantic benefactions, social ameliorations, and missionary operations of the present time are daily proof, and such will be more and more the religion of the future, but this will be nothing new. Human weakness will always more or less fail in its undertakings, but this is and always was the Christian ideal.

In the fifth negative we reach the red rag which always has enraged rationalism as much as the crimes of men. "The religion of the future will not be propitiary, sacrificial, or expia-

tory," says our author. Then he goes on to mention the source of religion as being "fear of the supernatural powers as represented in the awful forces of nature." He means to imply that there is no such thing as a divine revelation; all the religion there is has been evolved in the brain of man. In another place further on he says explicitly: "If, now, man discovers God through self-consciousness, or, in other words, if it is the human soul through which God is revealed, the race has come to the knowledge of God through knowledge of itself; and the best knowledge of God comes through knowledge of the best of the race." Even the elder Hodge, in his "*Systematic Theology*," appeals to human consciousness as a means of interpreting the divine nature, but to regard this power of the soul as the source of religion is one of the impossible conceptions of the evolution theory. But Dr. Eliot, building on nature-worship, claims that terror of imaginary deities led man to offer sacrifices to placate them and that both the Hebrews and "Paganized" Christians have perpetuated this expiatory notion of barbarous superstition. The fact is that it was man's bad conscience, his sense of guilt, that impelled him to propitiate God, or gods, by means of blood. Christianity answers this deepest cry of the remorseful heart because, on the theological side, it reveals the Father of grace, and because, on the anthropological and redemptory side, it furnishes the vicarious death of Christ as the ground of pardon. All the rest is only incident as not a few isolated passages or a strained exegesis, but the entire texture of the New Testament proves.

All theories of the Atonement count for little; it is the fact that we can not surrender. The first heresy of its deniers is their failure to recognize the exceeding sinfulness of sin. (Rom. 7:13). In their opinion there has been no fall, except a fall upward. They take delight in glorifying man, in portraying his pre-eminent talents, in forecasting his exalted destiny. But they minify the immense gulf which yawns between the ineffably Holy God and sinful man. Consequently all ethicalists teach that we can render an acceptable righteousness by our own efforts, that in fact there is no offended Divine Justice to be reconciled by anything but a virtuous life. This is the impossible dream of Pharisaism, Pelagianism, and mediaeval Popery. A sinner, however, can not in himself please the sin-hating God. He must have a substitute, a daysman, a representative and in-

tercessor, whose worthiness shall avail for him before the august throne, and such is Jesus Christ, the appointed Lamb who bears our sin, upon whom was laid the iniquity of us all. If the New Testament does not teach so, then human language has no definite meaning. The work-righteousness theory of the Jews and the ethical-merit theory of the new religion St. Paul and Martin Luther once swept from the palace-walls of truth as flimsy cobwebs before Logic's broom of steel. Yet these modernist spiders would spin the rent gossamer over again. But the old Gospel ship is not roomy enough to carry them across the sea. They are too much swollen with pride. Their conceit and vanity bulge too largely. Its passengers must be born from above. Man is in need of a heavenly dynamic to reconstruct his character.

The sixth negative is expressed as follows: The religion of the future will not perpetuate the Hebrew anthropomorphic representations of God. With the expletive "Hebrew" in that sentence to modify it, we readily adopt it. With the terminology which was necessary in the childhood of the race, when it could comprehend only pictorial revelation, we are no longer concerned. The shell of the old dispensation is not so precious that we would mourn its loss. Having extracted its kernel, we may carelessly cast it away. The civil laws and sacrificial rites of Moses are of little use to us except as types. But the Doctor asserts that these Hebraic conceptions "were in great measure carried over into institutional Christianity." Later on, however, he acknowledges that all ideas concerning God must necessarily be anthropomorphic. "What else," he asks, "can a human view of God's personality be? The finite can study and describe the infinite only through analogy, parallelism and simile; but that is a good way." Here, then, there is no dispute. We no longer desire to shape our thoughts in ancient moulds. The Jewish notion of Jehovah as King and Judge has been superseded by Divine Fatherhood as taught by Jesus. Thus the anthromorphism of this enlightened age has indeed made that of preceding centuries look "archaic and crude." Theology truly is a variable quality, but religion itself is unchangeable. The one is an immutable rock, the other is the foliage that grows and fades upon its crags year by year.

1 At we have come to the seventh and last formal negative.

"The religion of the future," prophesies the ex-President of Harvard "will not be gloomy, ascetic, or maledictory." We hope not, but when he goes into details and says, "It will believe in no malignant powers—neither in Satan, nor in witches. neither in the evil eye, nor in the malign suggestion," we have only to reply that, if, by any fair exegesis, the Bible teaches that God is a person, then it just as positively proves that the Evil One is. Of course, it is not hard for those who think that the Hebrews invented Jehovah to believe that they also invented Beelzebub. But those who are convinced that the Holy Spirit is a personal being, have no trouble to discern that diabolism is more than the principle of evil in the human heart personified into a symbolic devil. One of the most adroit tricks which his Satanic majesty plays is the jugglery by which he deludes his victims into dreaming that he is non-existent. In this manner he would, if possible, deceive the very elect. Thus, if not his horns, at least his temperament sticks out in various modern issues. His success in concealing his identity is no proof that there is no synagogue of Satan in the world. Hence this last negative, logically, proves too much; it also eliminates God, and thus, like ambition, as Shakespeare says, "o'er vaults itself."

In considering the "positive elements" of the new religion, Dr. Eliot says a great many good things, but he is so saturated with the spirit of modern criticism, that he can not quite forsake the negative style. It is of the very bone and marrow of rationalists to deal in negations. The art of pulling down is their specialty. It is in upbuilding that they fail. They take away our bread and instead thereof offer us stones. However, it is one of the merits of the "new religion" that it strives to be constructive.

We know that the unlimited can not be defined and therefore we must not attempt a narrow definition of God. Nevertheless, as Augustine admits, He may be conceived as being a sort of substance and certainly as having qualities, called attributes, which may be stated in certain terms. We may thus have clear, positive, definitive ideas of Him. But Dr. Eliot, like the Agnostic, who is fearful of committing himself to anything definite, takes refuge in the latitudinarian view of syncretism. The broad ideal he says, "will comprehend the Jewish Jehovah, the Christian universal Father, the modern physicist's omnipresent and

exhaustless Energy, and the biological conception of Vital Force." Surely this is accommodating enough. Under such a roof all the schools of modern thought can find shelter. But no Christian can consent to the terms "Energy" and "Force" as in any sense appositive of the Creator. These impersonal technicalities of science, like the word Providence, may express the mode by which the Preserver of the universe transmits his power through matter, or as Prof. T. G. Bonney says (*Sermons by World Scholars*, Vol. I, p. 186), they may be regarded as epiphanies of God, but they must not be apotheosized as equivalents of Deity. To do so is to use the language of Pantheism. Such banyan-tree theology reminds us of Pope's lines:

"Father of all! in every age,
In every clime adored,
By saint, by savage, or by sage—
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!"

But this poetic combination of all the henotheisms of the race does not comport with the absolute religion of Jesus, which is exclusive of all impersonal and materialistic conceptions of the Father. When Paul on Mars Hill declared to the Athenians, "In Him we live and move and have our being," he and his audience were not thinking exactly of the same Entity in precisely the same way. Interpolar spaces stretched between their differing ideas, nor were they capable of coalescence. Peary says, Destiny determined that he should discover the North Pole. Who, or what, is the god, or God, so named?

One of the singular, almost amusing, habits of the age is the emphasis which is so strongly placed upon the immanence of God, as to make the impression that it is a discovery of the nineteenth century. We recall that the Deists of the eighteenth denied it, teaching that the Creator made the world, wound it up like a clock, then withdrew from it into His empyrean and not thereafter manifesting enough interest in His children to give them either a revelation or a Redeemer. But when did the Christian Church believe in an absentee God, as Dr. Lyman Abbott seems to think? Divine omnipresence always was the creed of historic Christianity, as well as of Hebraism before it (See 139 *Psa.*). However, at the same time, as a corrective of

Pantheism, orthodoxy insists upon the divine transcendence; that God is indeed in all things, but also above and distinct from them, His works being only His garments, the King's royal robes. But God is not all, nor is all God. (Rom. 2:20).

Dr. Eliot in consonance with his intellectual aristocracy, speaks earnestly of the divine immanence, and all but topples over into the Pantheistic camp. He says, "If God is thoroughly immanent in the entire creation, there can be no secondary causes, in either the material or the spiritual universe." With such language Spinoza would readily agree, for in his opinion, secondary causes are a delusion, having only a modal existence. Even Paul taught the divine purpose to be "that God may be all in all," (I Cor. 15:28), and that "Christ is all and in all," (Col. 3:11), but he never for a moment confused the divine personality with the divine energy, firmly holding to the transcendence and absoluteness of God in the sense that He is free from all necessity whatsoever. With these limitations we all believe in the divine immanence. But an absentee God would, after all, be better than one who is imprisoned in the universe and comes to perfection only in it. To say that he expresses Himself in his works and laws, and that He is one with them, are two thoughts with inter-stellar distances between them. The first is the language of true Monotheism, the second that of Pantheism.

Mr. John Mill said "that the notion of God's omnipotence must be given up, if God is to be kept as a religious object." Prof. Wm. James comments that "he was surely accurately right" and adds, "I believe that the only God worthy of the name must be finite." (Curr. Lit. June 1909, p. 649). Thus we soon would have only a torso of the God of revelation. Yet this is the obscurantism of our brilliant new lights, the adumbrations of our modern religious comets!

But this is digression. To return to Dr. Eliot, we want to combat several inferences which he draws from the doctrine of the divine immanence. He says, "God is so absolutely immanent in all things, animate and inanimate, that no mediation is needed between Him and the least particle of His creation." This paragraph is in perfect agreement with one that follows later on, wherein he declares that the new religion "rejects also the entire conception of man as a fallen being, hopelessly wicked, and tending downward by nature." Here we behold another

recrudescence of the old Pelagianism, the crux of the perennial atonement controversy. Surely if man has no sin, he needs no Saviour; no disease, no balm of Gilead. That which we call moral depravity and which brought Christ to the cross is not guilt by imputation as original sin any more than is the anger of the tiger, the cunning of the fox, or the rutting of the goat—it is, in fact, only the abortive remnant of man's former animal nature which has not yet been sloughed off by the process of evolution. Such is the scientific account of human sin; hence in proud self-sufficiency it utterly repudiates the necessity of vicarious penalty-bearing and the consequent imputed righteousness of Christ. With loathing it rejects justification by faith and confides in salvation by character. Yet this is the central and controlling doctrine of the New Testament. Orthodoxy, however, never taught that man is "hopelessly wicked" or totally corrupt. He is salvable and capable by grace of angelic perfection. For this very purpose "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." (2 Cor. 5:19). The divine immanence, unless it is viewed as pantheistic identity with man, leaves room for an intercessor. As long as God is distinct from His creatures, a representative of both can stand between them.

All rationalists stumble at the origin of sin. They assume that they must account for it, which is not necessary. We need only accept the very apparent fact and make the best of it practically. But after eliminating all causes, except God, and rightly claiming that it can not exist uncaused, Unitarian theism, like logical Calvinism, must either consider God its author or deny it altogether. They choose the latter horn of the dilemma. But the origin of sin presents no difficulties to one who believes that the moral liberty of angels and men is perfect. God could not have created free agents in any adequate sense of the term, without allowing them the power of transgression. Otherwise they would not have been made in his own image, not free beings at all, but only highly organized animals controlled by the unchecked tyranny of their instincts—in other words, machines only a little elevated above the beast and vegetables of the field, which are utter strangers to freedom. God indeed created no Satan and no sinner, but these became such by the priceless gift of ethical liberty, an abuse which even the Almighty could have prevented only by the destruction of His highest creation.

Perhaps the first need that drives most men to religion is that of consolation in bereavement. When Dr. Eliot reaches this minor key in religious experience, he becomes pathetic. He evidently would be a poor comforter at a death-bed or a funeral. He would have little more to offer than Cato, who spent his last hours trying to cheer his soul with the consolations of philosophy. He states the case thus: "To the wretched, sick and down-trodden of the earth, religion has in the past held out hopes of future compensation. When precious ties of affection have been broken, religion has held out prospects of immediate and eternal blessings for the departed; and has promised happy reunions in another and a better world. To a human soul, lodged in an imperfect, feeble, or suffering body, some of the older religions have held out the expectation of deliverance by death, and of entrance upon a rich, competent, and happy life—in short, for present human ills, however crushing, the widely accepted religions have offered either a second life, presumably immortal, under the happiest conditions, or, at least, peace and a happy oblivion." Now the question is, "Can the new religion do so?"

He starts to give his answer by denying the supernatural and asserting that the new religion "will place no reliance on any sort of magic, or miracle, or other violation of, or exception to the laws of nature." This is a hoary argument. It goes on the pure assumption that all the laws of nature are known and that a miracle is an event that contravenes them. Modernists constantly speak of the laws of nature as though they were forces *per se*, instead of being only the *modus operandi* of energy not their own. They absolutely do nothing, are not efficient causes at all, as the Duke of Argyll demonstrates in his "Reign of Law;" they are only the manner, not even the means, by which things are done. Yet scientific devotion to them has become a cult which is paramount to pagan polytheism. But there is plenty of evidence that the supernatural, or extraordinary in physical law constantly contravenes nature. Every pumping station violates the rule that water always runs down hill or seeks its own level. The law of gravitation, one of the gods of science, is not indeed supplanted, or suspended, but successfully opposed, as Carlyle said, every time a man lifts his arm, by the miracle of human volition. If Eusapia Palladino lifts a

table without touching it with any part of her body, no spirit but her own will helping her, she is working above the ordinary laws of manipulation. So we see that the so-called supernatural is impossible only to the definitions of physical science and not to nature itself. Even Dr. Eliot acknowledges that "The line between the supposed natural and the supposed supernatural is not fixed but changeable."

Coming to the answer to the question he had raised, he says: "The new religion will not attempt to reconcile men and women to present ills by promises of future blessedness, either for themselves or for others. Such promises have done infinite mischief in the world, by inducing men to be patient under sufferings or deprivations against which they should have incessantly struggled." But this is the way the Christian martyrs overcame the Roman Empire and fulfilled the beatitude, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." Here we have the philosophy of Nietzsche, who, with Lafcadio Hearn, was one of the maddest present-day haters of Christianity, and the creator of the superman, who should brook no impediment to his appetites, passions, or self-will, not be submissive to any cross or moral law, but be himself almighty. Every anarchist and atheist of Europe swears by the dictum of this insane genius.

We do not forbid the cure of ills that are remediable. Christ did not drain the bitter cup, until His self-imposed destiny demanded it. Paul practiced resignation, but also struggled against injustice until the inevitable sword fell upon his neck. Let there be medicine, anesthetics, and surgery. The Church and the hospital are not enemies, and true religion cares for the bodies as well as for the souls of men. But eternity alone makes life worth living and its necessary ills bearable. It is a future hope that adorns and cheers our path.

"Do you ask," finally says Dr. Eliot on this subject, "what consolation for human ills the new religion will offer? I answer, the consolation which often comes to the sufferer from being more serviceable to others than he was before the loss or the suffering for which consolation is needed; the consolation of being one's self wiser and tenderer than before, and therefore more able to be serviceable to human kind in the best ways; the consolation through the memory, which preserves the sweet fragrance of characters and lives no longer in presence, recalls the joys

and achievements of those lives while still within mortal view, and treasures up and multiplies the good influences they exerted."

All this is very beautiful, because it is so true. But is this all? Robert J. Ingersol said more at the grave of his brother. While the ex-President of Harvard is silent about heaven and future blessedness the eloquent skeptic believed that the departed were "better now" and said: "From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word; but in the night of death hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing." In this case thus far the Agnostic strikes the higher chord of consolation.

Further on, however, Dr. Eliot redeems himself somewhat by declaring "that a loving God rules the universe. Trust in this supreme rule is genuine consolation and support under many human trials and sufferings." But this Biblical sentiment is quickly made of non-effect by the remark "that there are many physical and mental disabilities and injuries for which there is no consolation in a literal sense. Human skill may mitigate or palliate some of them, human sympathy and kindness may make them more bearable, but neither religion nor philosophy offers any complete consolation for them or ever has." Millions of believers in the consolatory promises have contradicted this pessimistic note. The conviction of future compensation, not in the sense of reward, but of readjustment of life's affairs, has made many a stony pillow soft and gave songs in the night to the early Christian martyrs.

Uhlhorn in his "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism" shows that when the old Pagan faith was dying and little but the skeleton of its ritual remained, there was a galvanic revival of moral-essay literature, men like Seneca writing beautifully of an ideal ethical life which they made no attempt to live. Faith was going and fancy was taking its place. The same is true to-day in all circles in which Christianity has been emasculated by that modernism which is the fruit of the destructive higher criticism. Divine sanctions having been given up, men are building the moral system which they think necessary for the preservation of society, upon such literary quicksands as their own brains have discovered. The books on ethics now issuing from the press are legion in number and enormous in bulk.

The entire scheme of national education in France (which has a host of sympathizers in America), is an attempt to inculcate virtue without God and a moral code without the Bible.

Ethical culture is to take the place of supernatural religion. An ethical society is to be a substitute for the Church. Only so much of the Decalogue is to be accepted as touches the relations of man to man and this fragment is to be regarded, not as a revealed law, but as a deduction from the principles of psychology and the evolution of ethnic customs. Only what can be erected on a scientific basis is to pass for civic and domestic and social righteousness. We are to have nothing higher in ethics, than an enlightened selfishness. We are to revert to the old Pagan hedonism. Aside from its exalted literature, the Bible as an inspired Book and Christianity as an institution are not to have any influence in the formation of character. Dr. Eliot seems to expect more social reformation and betterment of society from secret organizations and kindred bodies, than from the Church. He distinctly says the new religion is not to be bound to any "dogma, creed, or book." We are thus to have no spirit-level with which to find an even foundation for a grand ethical world-superstructure, but we are to rear it upon the apex of a pyramid. We are to have no arbiter except the panoramic human consciousness, which means our variable human feelings as they are mirrored in the dancing waves of our mercurial experience. In our day any crack-brained playwright, an Ibsen or a Bernard Shaw; any romancer, a Mrs. Humphrey Ward, or a Hall Caine; any nature student, a John Burroughs or a Haeckel; any female adventuress like Mrs. Olcott or Mrs. Eddy, or the art and literary cranks, that are too numerous to mention—all feel competent to invent new religions. In each case we are to take the *ipse dixit* of the originator of the novel cult as our theological standard. He has discarded the historic creeds and by consulting only the Delphic Python in his own soul has discovered the gospel of doubt, by whose liturgy we are to worship the unknown God and live according to a plastic moral law. To such spiritual anarchy, whose vogue it is to depose one tyrant only to set up another, usually a worse one, in his stead, Dr. Eliot has lent the influence of his name and there is rejoicing in the Bohemian camp.

While these inventors of a new faith grow eloquent over the

divine love, they hedge the divine justice, as though one was not as reasonable as the other or possibly inclusive of the other. Take away either and the perfect idea of God as an infinite Being is marred and becomes like an unsymmetrical statue. The disingenuousness of the whole tendency becomes apparent, when it is discovered that its purpose is to eliminate eternal punishment. It is astonishing with what ease these strangers to exegesis and logic can quench the penal fires of Gehenna. Dr. Eliot says: "The future religion will not undertake to describe, or even imagine, the justice of God. We are to-day so profoundly dissatisfied with human justice, although it is the result of centuries of experience of social good and ill in this world, that we may well distrust human capacity to conceive of the justice of a morally perfect, infinite being. * * The new religion cannot pretend to understand God's justice, inasmuch as there is no human experience of public justice fit to serve as the foundation for a true conception of God's."

We agree that the daily verdicts of our courts are a sad commentary on human justice. Even our Pardoning Boards are so inconsistent as to be aggravating, being unmistakably open to political and social influence. Oftentimes one criminal is executed, while another, equally guilty, escapes through a legal technicality. At best our judges, usually honest, are only fallible men and few of their deliverances receive the universal approval of the bench. But the same is true of human charity; it is a most defective quality. Is it not very singular, therefore, that a man who confessedly has no higher source of knowledge, than human experience, should be so very sure of the love of God and so very uncertain of His justice? He is ready to accept all that nature and the course of civilization teach concerning compassion, which is a reality in social economy, but distrusts his own sources with reference to the condemnation and punishment of transgression and infraction of law. But shall a man only on the side of rectitude reap as he has sown? Can one gather walnuts from the hawthorne bush? "Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat of the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Isa. 3:10).

Why does not Dr. Eliot and his school abide by the conception of divine justice depicted in the Scriptures? Subjective reli-

gionists always are wiser in their own conceit, than the sacred oracles. But their gross inconsistency appears in that they accept one phase and not the other on this subject. The second life they adopt, but the second death they spurn. But logical exegesis disowns their one-sided speculation and declares that if there is not eternal perdition, neither is there eternal salvation, for the same Greek adjective (*alóvιος*) characterizes both states as being of the same quality and duration. However, we agree that neither the one nor the other forms a proper motive for the religious life. The woman, who, in ancient days, walked through the streets of Alexandria, having a torch in one hand and a pail of water in the other, crying, "With this I will burn up Heaven and with this I will extinguish Hell, so that men may serve God only from love," delivered a message that is good for all ages and lands. While in the first stages of spiritual awakening carnal moods may pertain, the regenerated soul soon casts off such skin-deep sentiments and sings:

"My God, I love Thee—not because
I hope for heaven thereby,
Nor yet because, if I love not,
I must forever die.
Should I not love Thee well?
Not for the sake of winning heaven,
Or of escaping hell."

Concerning church-union Dr. Eliot pronounces the past a failure and the future hopeless and offers his own scheme as promising a better result. As far as co-operation for the good of man goes, all denominations can and often do work together. But rather than form an organic union on the basis of the new religion, they will do well to remain far apart. We never can unite around the focus of an infallible Church or around the focus of an infallible reason, but only around the focus of an infallible person, and that person Jesus the Christ, Son of God and Son of Man. Rabbi Hirsch declares that the line between the Reformed Hebrews and the Unitarians is very thin. But Christianity can unite only in Christ, not outside of Him. Ours is the absolute religion, with a thick and broad line to differentiate it from all others. The *Sine Qua Non* brooks no rival, and will

not be unequally yoked in a meaningless union. Truth is better and higher than fraternity and dare not be compromised. As there must be some unit as a bond of federation, the claim of Unitarianism as the rallying ground of the many divisions of faith seems plausible—one God, let all join hands under His banner, let all the rays center in that Sun! But Mohammedanism is rigidly Unitarian, yet it is split up into numerous sects. So this latest effort to unite all the various spokes of a great wheel in one golden hub also must fail.

Of course, Lutherans could not expect Dr. Eliot's religion to please them because they know at the outstart that he would ignore all real sacraments. The new religion would offer grace without means of grace. Emerson was consistent and honorable, when, as a minister, he discovered that his people looked for something more than a symbolic memorial in the Lord's Supper, he left the pulpit to become a philosopher. If the celebration of sacraments once becomes only a formal rite, they would better be discontinued altogether. But on this subject Dr. Eliot is not clear. He says "Its sacraments will be, not invasions of law by miracle, but the visible signs of a natural spiritual grace, or of a natural hallowed custom. It may preserve historical rites and ceremonies, which, in time past, have represented the expectation of magical or miraculous effects; but it will be content with natural interpretations of such rites and ceremonies." In another place he says: "Moreover, such a religion has no tendency to diminish the force in this world, or any other, of the best human imaginings concerning the nature of the infinite Spirit immanent in the universe."

Now all this is as mystical as the old mystics whom modernism is so ardently trying to resuscitate. It may mean something, anything, or nothing. We are sure, however, that the "Spirit" here mentioned is not the Holy Ghost with whom we are acquainted and that the "sacraments" here named are not the instruments of the Third Person in the Holy Trinity. Such language is more congruous with the mysticism of old Eckhart and Tauler, than with conservative Lutheranism. In the new religion Baptism and The Communion are only allegories. Thus rationalism always ends in a cloudy theosophy, ever bordering on a dreamy Ultima Thule which defies all boundaries and all

sensible definitions. What it calls sacraments are only more or less refined symbols or signs, not vehicles, of grace.

Dr. Eliot does not think his Religio Nova will become paramount as an organized body. "The great mass of the people remain attached to the traditional churches, and are likely to remain so," he says, but the new product "will progressively modify the creeds and religious practices of all the existing churches, and change their symbolism and their teachings concerning the conduct of life."

It remains to be seen how much leavening of the whole mass this small lump can effect. It has charmed the Bohemian class, artists, literateurs, sciolists, and some superior intellectuals, but no slum-workers and no pastors, who do the work of evangelists; just as Spiritualism and Christian Science have captured many idiots and charlatans of society; however, in New England, where this boasted illumination has had free course for the longest time, the result has been the melancholy ruin of Andover Seminary, the surrender of Plymouth Rock to the Vatican, and the recruiting of the ranks of infidelity from the homes of the Puritans. Wherever this thistle-down has been blown, its history has been the same. From Boston, *via* Chicago to San Francisco, the serpent's trail and sting in the bosom of the Church is seen to poison her life, to cool her zeal, to hamstring her activities, and to hide her lamp under a bushel. May the Lord help us to keep and practice the old religion.

Dr. Eliot winds up his pronunciamento with the following conclusion: "Finally, this twentieth century religion is not only to be in harmony with the great secular movements of modern society—democracy, individualism, social idealism, the zeal for education, the spirit of research, the modern tendency to welcome the new, the fresh powers of preventive medicine, and the recent advances in business and industrial ethics,—but also in essential agreement with the direct personal teaching of Jesus, as they are reported in the Gospels. The revelation he gave to mankind thus becomes more wonderful than ever."

No doubt this resume will prove a prophecy, but its fulfillment will not be according to the way its author thinks. Religion will more than ever be the hand-maid of civilization, education, and art, so far as these shall contribute to the good of men and the extension of God's kingdom among them. Christianity is not

a totally other-world religion. We will burn no Brunos, humiliate no Galileos, excommunicate no Luthers, but welcome all new discoveries, save new religions. Such a dissertation as we have been considering is not an essential or adequate exposition of the Gospel of Christ. Jesus would not recognize this twentieth century edition of his message as a true copy of the original. It does not rest upon the same foundation. "Give me a place where I may stand and I will move the world," said Archimedes. This the new religion fails to furnish for the spiritual and moral elevation of the race. Earlier Dr. Eliot had said, "The two sentiments which most inspire men to good deeds are love and hope." These are two mighty levers to lift a sinking world, provided they have a sufficient fulcrum and foothold. That fulcrum in the religion of Jesus is faith and its foothold is His empty, rocky tomb, the very things that this new concoction does not furnish, but which modernism is endeavoring to undermine as superstition. Faith, hope, charity: these three and the greatest, but not the first or fundamental, is charity. Root, flower, fruit: the greatest fruit; but this is speaking rhetorically and according to climateric values. However, scientifically, the root is the greatest, because, while it is independent of flower and fruit, they are dependent upon it. They can not possibly flourish without it, but it can glory in existence without them. So there can be no hope or love without faith. It must be first. It alone is fundamental; they are not, but are beautiful blossoms and fruit of the faith-principle that lies deep in the fertile soil of the human heart.

The claim is often made that all criticism should be sympathetic, in the sense that we should consider every man's opinion from his own standpoint. But how can we sympathize with a man who denies the Deity of Christ? A beardless professor, after a surreptitious attempt to cast doubt upon the resurrection of Jesus, in the March (1910) *Homiletic Review*, ends by saying, "The discussion of the resurrection may well be carried on, then, in the most dispassionate manner." He also agrees with Dr. George Gordon's book on "Religion and Miracle," that belief in the resurrection is not essential to "religious" life. Perhaps not, but such belief is essential to the fullest *Christian* life. For the sake of a class of people who consider themselves too brainy to accept miracles, we are to surrender Christ's historically demon-

strated resurrection. And we are to do so with unconcerned coolness! As well might the men of his day have expected Napoleon to have remained nonchalant, if some one had proposed that he should dispense with his highly prized cannon. By the resurrection we have won our Wagrams and Austerlitzes. Without it we should long ago have met our Waterloo. Yet on the eve of a grand movement for the world's evangelization we are asked to throw our chief weapon on the scrap pile! No; let us keep on bombarding the enemy with the old ordnance that served us so well in the past. This is no time for parley, but for battle and victory. Confucius, with his all-this-world philosophy, was very little behind the "new religion." The Pharisees and Sadducees would not have crucified Jesus, if He had so taught. But now, as then, and always the case is as He put it, when He said: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight." (Matt. 11:25, 26).

York, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEPARTED SOULS.

BY REV. FRED. S. GEESEY.

On this subject bearing on eschatology, the teaching of Jesus, the Christ, and His Apostles must give us the needed information. Hence, the state of the departed souls is a Christian doctrine which we do and must accept on the teaching of revelation only.

In the consideration of such a theme, we must take it for granted that man is immortal. This presumption is organically included in the Old and the New Testaments. Man, by his creation, is lifted up above all other ranks of earth's creatures and is made in the image and "likeness of God." Hence, man is a moral and spiritual personality—a being of free-will, and intelligence, capable of thinking God's own thoughts after Him and holding ethical and spiritual fellowship with the Creator. Therefore, because of this Godhood in manhood, this divine expiration becoming man's inspiration, man is immortal.

Or as Elihu in Job 33:4 says: "The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." The sad story of Scripture is also that *man*, because of sin, in consequence of the fall of our first parents and our present sinful state of nature, is mortal and death comes and dissolves this habitat of the soul, this sanctuary of the Spirit, this enshrinement of Deity, and we stand by the open graves and say, when the body is laid in the grave, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Or as Ecclesiastes 12:7 has it: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Or as Job 14:10 puts it: "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Hence, because of sin, death comes and terminates this present bodily life. When this dissolution of the personal union between the body and soul and the consequent resolution or resolving of the body into its physical elements takes place, we find human death to be a separate problem from the death of other creatures. Other creatures die and remain dead as far as we

have any knowledge or revelation on that subject, *but* the human body, this mortal shall put on immortality, and shall rise again. Since Jesus, the Christ, is "become the first fruits of them that slept," His resurrection from the dead is the beginning of a work that shall only end when once the body of every child of God has been raised from its place of rest and brought home to glory. Thus physical death awaits us all. Yet, to the believing soul, death is not an unforgiven penalty; because in the progress of salvation, the believer is lifted above its sting and fear, and death itself is made the gateway to the presence of the Lord and "the rest remaining." And when our body shall rise, death is wholly destroyed to the believer, while to the unbeliever and rejecters of salvation, death remains the unrepealed penalty of continued sin. Thus "man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" This is then the question: Where are the dead? What is the present state of the departed souls? The revealed teachings of Christ give us an *intermediate* state with two different conditions of the departed in that intermediate state. Presuming that the soul is immortal and teaching that it is so, it lives on after the dissolution between the body and soul has taken place. The soul may live in a state of spiritual death or in a state of spiritual happiness, yet in continued existence. We confess, in studying this subject, we find and meet with questions of great difficulties. But the Scripture assertions bearing on our topic, are sufficient for our faith, and open to speculative minds many problems to which varied answers are given. Our aim is to mark the chief points of truth assured us by the Scriptures.

First. As to the present state of the departed wicked and unbelieving. We believe and therefore teach that such souls are already suffering the penal consequences of sin. John 3:36, "*He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*"

Our Savior has given Himself into death on Golgotha's cross for human sin and guilt. By that vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, the Christ, His obedience and suffering were in place and instead of ours and become the only ground on which the sinner is accepted of God. Hence, God through Christ's death on the cross, is propitiated and human guilt is expiated and cancelled. Ro-

mans 8:1-4, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, etc."

To the unbelievers and rejecters of Christ and His salvation, the curse or condemnation, in consequence of the fall in sin and a life in sin, still abides and is to such in effect as though Christ Jesus had not died to satisfy divine justice and righteousness. Hence, such unbelieving, wicked, grace-rejecting souls separated from the body, abide under the retributive action in which sin works eternal death. The soul as a spirit-unit, dissolved from the body, but surviving the body, is in a state of spiritual death. Christ's teaching of the ungodly rich man in the parable compels us to say that he lived, after his demise, and found the result and fruitage of his life in sin to be immediate misery. Lazarus at Dives' door and under his eye, had been his final trial, and his neglect of the poor the last drop that had made the cup of God's long-suffering to run over. Dives sought to save his life by faring "sumptuously every day," but lost it when his flattering dreams of ease and self-enjoyment by death awakened him in the awful and terrible realities of eternity. The fruitage and immediate effect of Dives' life was remorse in *Hades*. Of Judas the betrayer of our Savior, it is said in Acts 1:25, "That he might go to his *own* place." We are not sufficiently told to what *place* Judas went. We know Judas fell, or rather threw himself by deserting and betraying his master, from the place of an Apostle, of which he was unworthy,—and all "that he might go to his own place." This place of course was that of a traitor, which was not only the gibbet, but the place and state fitted for him and he for it,—hell. The supposition and teaching of Peter in his assertion is that the place and state of misery was "his own place." Therefore Jesus says of Judas in Matt. 26:24, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born." It is surely not worth while to be born into this world to go out of it finally and end in eternal misery. This is worse than not being. But God's children shall finally leave this world and enter a state and place of everlasting blessedness and happiness, and for all such it is worth while to have "been born." Heaven will make amends for all the sorrows and miseries of earth. "Earth has no sorrows that heaven cannot cure." In this intermediate state of the wicked departed souls, though they are lost and suffer already the penal consequences of unchecked sin,

there "is a stage of advance through the resurrection to condemnation."

While in this present state of misery, the wicked departed spirits will have, it seems, a tormenting prospect of the happiness of others. Thus Dives, in the parable, is represented as "seeing Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom." This sight aggravated his misery as it would that of a man perishing with hunger to see others feasting, but could himself not come to the feast. Or as Christ teaches in Luke 13:28, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." Thus the present state of the departed wicked is that they now remember, with what contempt they treated serious piety and religion, and in vain will they wish to be in the place and state of those whom they once despised. It is remorse and the beginning of hell itself when they think for what they have lost their immortal souls. If such be the present state of the wicked departed souls, what added torment and increased rage and fury must be their state when they advance in misery through resurrection to condemnation. Let Jesus, the Christ, give the decision in Matt. 25:46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

Second. The present state of the departed believers. This state is one of happiness with the Lord. We are safe in saying this without human fancy and inventive fabrication. St. Paul makes absence from the body equivalent to presence with the Lord. In Phil. 1:23, Paul says, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ." Poor Lazarus was carried to Abraham's bosom, and his soul was there in a state of happiness. Lazarus, or the person or soul whom Christ means by the parable, was perfectly conscious of his condition, that it was a changed and happy state into which he had come. The penitent thief on the cross was to be with Christ in Paradise the very hour or day of his death. In Rev. 6:9 John sees "under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Those martyrs, slain because they were God's witnesses on earth, are spoken of as present in the worship of heaven. Even such in heaven, the spirits of the just made perfect, "retain a proper resentment of

the wrong they have sustained by their cruel enemies." The honor of God, and of Christ and the Gospel demand a just recompense of reward. We believe there is joy, even in heaven, at the just punishment and destruction of the inexorable enemies of Christ and Christianity, as well as at the conversion of sinners. All these blood-washed souls spoken of by St. John were there in a state of happiness, without their bodies, yet in perfect personal consciousness and possessing their true personal faculties of knowledge and enjoyment. While the present state of the departed believing souls is one of personal consciousness and happiness, this present felicitous state differs from the ultimate condition or state, in this, that, in this present state, the departed souls *await* the full redemption of the body through the resurrection.

I Cor. 15:53, 54. "This corruptible must put," etc. Thus our departed loved ones who have died or departed in the faith are happy now, and are truly saved, and established in the principles of holiness. Yet the crowning blessing, happiness and benediction of redeeming love shall take place, when "the trumpet shall resound, and the Lord shall descend," then the souls of the believing shall enter the resurrected body, and in union of soul and body they will enter upon the full and ineffable fruition of heaven.

We have not entered into a discussion of the varied theories about the intermediate state, nor shall we speak of Rome's whole realm of souls divided into various *receptacula*. Let it suffice to say, that the whole teaching of Romanism on *limbus patrum*, *limbus infantum* and purgatory is nothing more than a human fabrication and merely ecclesiastical, and the Scriptures quoted for Rome's substantiation afford us no warrant for its self-made scheme. We as Protestants and as Lutherans must reject the scheme of Rome as in direct conflict with the doctrine of justification by faith.

Third. The present state of the departed souls in relation to an opportunity of grace. The question with many is, whether the fate of the countless multitudes of mankind dying without any knowledge of Christ and His Gospel is closed with this earthly probation. Also whether the state and fate of those neglecting or rejecting salvation is closed when they die, or whether a second chance will be afforded such.

There are some devout and scholarly men who contend for a second probation, a *post mortem* probation, and assert that such who have died in ignorance of the Christ and His Gospel shall have a *post mortem* chance to accept salvation. Others claim that even those having wilfully rejected the offered redemption shall have a second chance.

This theory or teaching alleges that no person will be finally judged until he has had a chance to accept salvation through a fair knowledge of the Savior. One of the chief or main passages of Scripture used by *Progressive Theology* is that of I Peter 3:18-22: We humbly confess this is one of the most enigmatical portions of holy writ, and not easily explained, but on fair exegesis no one can prove a second probation from the intended teaching of that passage. If Christ preached personally in Hades or to "the spirits in prison," which is the most generally defended interpretation, He did not offer grace to such as had no previous opportunity but to such who "were disobedient" when called. If it was an offer of mercy in prison or Hades, it was a *second* offer to rejecters of grace, because there is no hint of its acceptance, neither from I Peter 4:6, nor Matt. 12:31-32, nor from Phil. 2:9-11, or Col. 1:19:20, can such certainty of a future probation in Hades be drawn. A second chance or *post mortem* probation is not the Gospel message of Christ Jesus nor of His inspired Apostles. But the teaching of the Gospel is that God through Jesus Christ has provided salvation, forgiveness of sin, and all its means thereto,— "a provision in which both its nature and design, all men may be saved on condition of repentance and faith." Now in the day of grace "is the accepted time." "Now is the day of salvation." The business of salvation is a present one. Isaiah 55:1-3, "Ho, every one that thirsteth," etc. Matt. 11:28-30, "Come unto Me all ye that labor," etc. Rev. 3:20, "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man," etc. Rev. 22:17, "And the Spirit and the Bride say come," etc. Matt. 23:37, "Oh, Jerusalem," etc. Heb. 2:3, "How shall we escape, etc.?" Thus we might go on and quote many, many passages of similar bearing as the reader well knows. Unbelief in Jesus, the Christ, as their own personal Savior is the one great condemning sin of mankind to-day, as it was in Christ's day. To be temporarily and eternally saved

we must repent of sin, comply with the conditions of salvation and accept Christ Jesus by faith now.

"Go ye into all the world." Now in this day of grace we are to go and preach the Christ. The true exegesis of Scripture everywhere in the Bible points to death as the closing of human probation. The state of the wicked after death is fixed and is so declared in the Word.

The door to the foolish five Virgins was shut. Not that God closed the door on them, but their own spiritual lethargy and neglect to known duty closed the door upon the foolish Virgins. Jerusalem did not know the day of its visitation, though Christ preached and wept over it. The ungodly rich man would have gladly changed his state or condition had he had a chance to do so. He prayed to have it changed, but his prayer was not answered as he prayed. He still prays for a drop because he denied the crumb. The other character of the parable, Lazarus, is still happy and blessed and shall continue to be so forever.

Many other Bible incidents and passages of Scripture could be treated and quoted to show that not a single explicit assurance of a human probation or extension of it is found in the Word to give comfort to those lost in the intermediate state. If the countless multitudes of heathen who died without a knowledge of the Gospel and the plan of salvation are saved, they are saved because Christ Jesus "tasted death for every man." Not on their merit or comparative innocency can such or any be saved, but because Christ is "the propitiation for the sins of the world."

Dr. Christleib, in "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 115, says: "Scripture nowhere teaches that all who die without knowledge of the revelation of God through Christ are irretrievably lost. It is one thing innocently not to *know*, it is quite another thing wilfully to reject. The express teaching of God's Word is that men will be judged hereafter according to their works and knowledge, and that the measure of such judgment will be the degree of revelation, supernatural and natural vouchsafed to them in this present life." The sad, unfortunate state and circumstances in which the heathen especially are placed seem, to many, to demand at least, a great hope, that their dying without the Gospel and knowledge of Christ, shall give them a second or rather their first chance to accept or reject the Savior. But all such teaching can at best be but a seeming justifiable

pity or inference taken from the general love and justice of God, as conceived of by man. There is a great deal of teaching and preaching in our day that is an insult to the moral sense, and causes the Word preached to lose hold on men. Shall we not say that all will be judged according to the light, natural or supernatural, they have had. And on the basis of an actual atonement in Jesus, the Christ for the sins of the whole world, there will be not only a *just* but a merciful judgment "which," says Dr. Valentine, in his notes on "Outlines in Theology," p. 261, "may accept even such as knew Him not, if they have lived according to the light given them." There are men, and many of them, without the Bible or Gospel, but none without God. Obedience to given light shows the submissive disposition ready to move into the higher obedience of faith when the truth comes.

There may be implicit faith, waiting to become explicit faith. We have an example of this in Abraham, Rom. 4:9-11. In this case we have *Faith* reckoned to Abraham for righteousness when he was still in an uncircumcised state. Circumcision to Abraham was the seal of righteousness. Abraham was a good Lutheran before his circumcision. Implicit faith, or obedience to given light, he had, until the true light came and created explicit faith.

The whole world is under a mediatorial probation now, not after the death of mankind. It is our imperative business to give the heathen the Gospel, or else we may not have as good a chance of being saved as they have. Capernaum did less than Sodom would have done with equal opportunities of salvation. But if the heathen or any of them be saved without the Gospel and a knowledge of Christ, they are so saved not because there is a *post mortem* probation, but because Christ Jesus, the God-man, is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

Since Christ has suffered for the sins of the human race, the heathen sustain an open relation to forgiveness. The human heart was made for God and cannot rest without Him.

Spring Forge, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

GLIMPSES OF EARLY LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D.

Between the theological beginnings of Luther and the Concordia Book of 1580, lies a period of intensest interest. In it, when understood, are to be found in essentials the fixed and final elements of Lutheran doctrine. Therefore every path made across these fields is of more than momentary interest. Specially is this true when the pathfinder is himself no novice in the matter. This is the case in a noteworthy degree respecting the modernized summary presented to the Church in Professor Tschackert's "Origin of Lutheran Doctrine." ("Entstehung der Lutherischen und Reformierten Kirchenlehre." Professor P. Tschackert Ordentlich Professor of Theology, Gottingen. Vandershoeck und Ruprecht. 1910).

In the development of Lutheran doctrine from Luther's death to the Book of Concord, Prof. Tschackert, after discussing the various controversies which ran so high and threw so lurid a light on the acerbities of the theological discussions, gives an analysis of the Church Regulations which from time to time were issued by the different German principalities and municipalities which had embraced the Reformation and now needed to give it form and validity in their respective sphere of influence and especially in their own legal bounds. ("Tschackert, pages 572-620).

These regulations, styled "Kirchenordnungen" or Agenda, were many and of varied worth. They have not all been given their proper place as aids to the understanding of the later Lutheran doctrine and documents, for the simple reason that up to date there is no complete exhaustive edition of these State papers. (The work is now being done by Sehling. *Die Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts*). Tschackert has collated them and here and there furnishes us the definitions and the explanations which they give of elemental Lutheran doctrine, and to which they held both their teachers and pastors.

Following in the main his narrative, I have drawn out some

of these facts as illustrations of our doctrinal growth through an era of great disturbance, but also of high theological fecundity and profound moral earnestness.

The work of the theologians produced the doctrines of Lutheranism and Calvinism, but the theologians would have labored in vain had the results of this toil not been publicly acknowledged. Tschackert insists that one may set up the theory that the truth must be self-perpetuating whether or not it is legalized, but practically it does not so work out; for, although the Reformers had perfect confidence in the truth of their doctrine and teaching, yet had the authorities of Germany and Switzerland declared against them, they in all probability would have had the same untimely fate as befell the Protestantism of Italy, France and Spain. But in Germany and Switzerland the Reformation was protected by the authorities through the means of *Kirchenordnung*.

These *Kirchenordnung* had to do with cultus, relation of the Church to State, and more especially with the teaching or doctrine.

The first of these Church Orders were regulations for Church service. They had their beginning in 1527 in Luther's "Formula Missae" which was prepared for the Wittenberg Church and introduced the evangelical conception of the Lord's Supper; then followed at once also his "Tanflichlein." Short use of these brought about the first Lutheran Order of Church Service for the Dukedom of Prussia. It was composed by Luther's three friends, Brieszmann, Speratus and Poliander, but given out with the authority of the two Evangelical Bishops Polentz and Quiesz under the title "Artikele der Ceremonium und anderer *Kirchenordnung*." It regulated Church Services and congregational life.

In 1526 there followed from Wittenberg, Luther's "Deutsche Messe und Ordnung der Gottesdienstes," a liturgical writing "which was fundamental for the Church Service Orders of all Lutheran Churches."

It had also importance through Luther's conception of the merely relative value of such liturgical services in general, Luther saying in the preface: "Before all things I beg all who use this our Order of Service, that they make out of it no necessary law nor thereby entangle any one's conscience." He sends it

out because he believes it will aid the real "matter"—the cause of the Gospel—and because he has heard of the difficulties which have arisen through the heterogeneous services used.

Then comes the "Kirchenordnung für Schwabisch und das Hallische Land," outlined by Brenz, also in 1526. A number of others followed, but in 1528 there was a really epochal advance in the "Unterricht der Visitationen in Kurfürstentum Sachsen." These were prepared by Melancthon. They were his famous Visitation Articles, and were issued with the approval of Luther. Here for the first time in connection with the service there is a *Lehrordnung* or regulation for instruction which has to do chiefly with confession, faith and good works. This work of Melancthon's was a pioneer and exercised decisive weight upon a whole series of following *Kirchenordnungen*. Though a number were not independent, notably Bugenhagen, 1528; Hamburger 1529; Lubecker 1531; Schleswig-Holsteiner 1542, and others mostly more or less under the influence of Bugenhagen. These all were issued with special reference to pedagogical motives, teaching the children through the catechism and the congregations by the preaching of the Word. They had no special development of doctrine.

Melancthon's Visitation Articles, on the contrary, began at once to bear fruit along doctrinal lines. First through the *Predigt-Anmerkung* of Herzog Ernst the Confessor in 1535. Duke Ernst noticed that many preachers were unskilled in the new teaching. Already in 1529 he had issued a "Short Sketch, What They Shall Teach." It emphasized repentance and forgiveness of sin; the law to be preached to awaken repentance; the sin forgiven through Christ, and eternal life certain through Him. Both forgiveness and life alone are through Christian faith. Faith is thus presented in truly evangelical way. Quite a full analysis follows, touching upon relation of the individual to the State; prayer; freedom and the doctrine of the Sacraments.

Two striking *Ordnungen* came into view at the first. The *Kirchenordnung* of the State of Hanover of 1536, and the *Lippische Kirchenordnung* of 1538. Hanover by the payment of four thousand gold gulden to their Catholic overlord had received the right of religious freedom. At once Urbanus Rhegius, the Superintendent, prepared for the cities a *Kirchenord-*

nung. It discusses first what the true Church is, in order to meet the Catholic charge of a falling away of the faith. It showed how Christianity had its form and being since the time of the apostles; how then the Evangelical movement in Germany had begun, insisting that those called Lutherans and who had confessed their faith at Augsburg had never separated from the true Church, but only from its base leaven of Pharisees and Sadducees. "There is a great difference between separation from false prophets and from the true Church. We do not leave the Church. God forbid. We do not reject all we have found in it, only that which is contrary to the Gospel. We believe also in a universal Christian Church, as wide as the world, which we love and honor as our true mother. But the voice of our Shepherd, that shall we hear."

The Lippische Ordnung was examined and approved by Luther, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melancthon as "right and Christian." This sets forth in the case of each matter spoken of the false teachings of Rome, and then by way of contrast, the right teaching of the Gospel. "The Gospel is a joyous message of the forgiveness of sin. Through the Gospel is man blessed. Through the Gospel, which is received by faith, we are renewed, receive the Holy Spirit and do good works."

With regard to free will is taught: "According to Holy Scriptures the natural man is, before being born again through the Holy Spirit, in divine things, blind. Therefore is the Holy Spirit and the grace of Christ according to Scriptures, first necessary."

True faith is this, that "We have sure, certain, undoubting trust in God, that He is gracious to us....will forgive our sins through Christ out of grace alone, apart from all works and laws, and make us righteous through Christ the Son of God." This faith produces two results: "First it changes and justifies heart and life, which brings peace with God and the Holy Ghost, who works in the hearts of believers; further, it produces all sorts of good works." This faith is a gift of God. "It arises from the preaching and hearing of the Word of God through the inworking of the Holy Spirit."

Good works "are those which....have God's Word and command, such as please Him on account of our Lord Christ. That is works which takes place out of faith." "The motives of good

works are three: First, Obedience to God's command; second, that others may be incited to the same; and third, that a Christian may thereby strengthen his faith and make certain his hope." Yet dare all these works not be reckoned as merit, since they are really workings of the Holy Ghost in the believer.

In the section on Church Service, we have the definition of the Church. "The Christian Church is a spiritual body of all the chosen and believing scattered over all the world who believe in Christ, use the Confession of Baptism and Sacrament, whose Head is Christ and they His body.....In spiritual matters under the thrall of none other than Christ alone...."

Returning to the Brandenburg-Nurnburg Kirchenordnung, we notice it is in two parts: First, a doctrinal and service section; then a series of catechism or children's sermons. There were many copies and editions of this Kirchenordnung, among others by Osiander and Johann Brenz.

Above all, the very purpose of this Order is to be a teaching or doctrinal order. It discusses, therefore, law and Gospel, sin and repentance. Characteristic is the presentation of the Gospel as "the preaching of the satisfying and saving activity of Christ." "The Gospel is nothing other than a good joyous message of our dear Lord Jesus Christ."

As a Mediator, "He directs all His life according to the will of the Father, does for us what we were indebted to do for ourselves, fulfills the law and all righteousness for us." This is satisfaction through active obedience. Besides, He takes upon Himself all our sins and suffers all that which should have been our retribution. That is passive obedience.

Finally, "He prays for us poor sinners that God will receive us into grace"—that is Christ's intercession for us. (Rom. 8:1; Heb. 5.) After Christ through obedience, suffering and intercession has wrought for us, and thereby as the Exalted One has become Lord over all, He works with us. This last phase of the thought is developed strongly according to the Osiandrian view of Justification.

Through the preaching of the Gospel, Christ perfects the work of our justification. "The Gospel brings us first forgiveness of sin and thereby in our conscience peace." Further the Gospel brings us the Righteousness of Christ and makes it our own so that we may take the same and comfort ourselves as that it hap-

pened for us, was presented to us, and is as though we had ourselves done it."

This justification stands upon these two chief points, forgiveness of sin and the gift of Christ's Righteousness which is received through faith. "Such justification should make its recipients active servants of the Father, lest again they trust in their own works."

Further, and this has an Osiandrian tinge, the Gospel brings Christ Himself in the heart of the believer, and not Christ only, but also the Father and the Holy Ghost. Fourth: We are through the Gospel new born. Further here follows, after such new birth, also a new life, for the Holy Spirit sheds into our hearts. But love fulfills the law and out of it spring all sorts of good fruits.

Baptism is accounted a work of God on the baptized. Baptism of necessity is permitted to be performed by laity. The blessing of woman after child-birth is done away with as a bit of superstition, as though woman by becoming a mother was in any way profaned. In this order of baptism preceeding the *Renunciatio diaboli* there occurred exorcisms.

With reference to the Lord's Supper, Book 38 of this Order makes Lutheran explanation, doing away with the Romish offering idea. Church garments are retained "in order that the server of the church should not always be in their own garments, so that they might serve their congregations in all bravery and honesty," For simplicity, however, the Church soon came to use the cope only.

The pastors were admonished that they upon the salvation of their souls should proceed with all care to perform their offices, and the laity also were urged to "receive their pastors as shepherds of the soul, and hold them in all honor." The pastors were to act in accordance with the *Visitationsordnung*. Where doubt or difficulty arose, an appeal was to be made to the authorities. At the close there was noted with modesty a method of procedure where the articles might prove insufficient. It was that the pastors "should act according to the Divine Word, and diligently pray our Lord God that He might grant His grace and graciously communicate to us eternal salvation."

The *Wurtemberg Ordnung* in the year 1535 depended largely upon the above. It brought out a "common church Order as it

was to be held everywhere throughout the Principality of Württemberg." It was composed by Schnepf and expedited by Brenz. In this Order of Church Service there was no special presentation of doctrine. "It might be of need," said the introduction, "that we give a form of doctrine and teaching as well as of ceremonies, seeing that the former is of so much greater weight." They, however, consider that evangelical doctrine is already sufficiently known to save them this task. Tschackert says that the tone of the articles was that of a Lutheran colored Biblicism.

Another order published in 1540 also depended largely on the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Ordnung. This was the Kirchenordnung of the Mark-Brandenburg. In the section "of the Doctrine" we read: "The pure faith is not without knowledge of sin and repentance." Now just "here is the chief article and sum of the whole Gospel, that clear and pure, irrespective of all human antagonism must be taught and held even to death, this, namely, that we obtain in forgiveness of sins, justification and finally eternal salvation, out of the pure grace of God, alone through faith in the redemption of Christ, without addition of the worthiness of our works, desert, neither, on account of the worthiness of our sorrow or repentance." Fruits must follow. Where they do not, there the really true faith has not come into the heart.

The second part contains the Kinderpredigten. The third part is devoted to ceremonies as well as to "the use of the Holy revered Sacrament." This Ordnung has as its characteristic that in matters of ceremonial it held to many old Catholic ways as far as "they were not apart from the Divine Word." The policy was probably accentuated by the political friendliness of the Kurfürst Joachim II, of Brandenburg for the Emperor. At baptism chrism and salt were retained as symbols for spirit and wisdom, a white garment as symbol of innocence, and the burning torch in the hand of the baptized as a type of Christian belief.

In the Lord's Supper administered in both forms, the elevation was retained, though done away with previously in Wittenberg. Visiting the sick took the place of extreme unction. But if the priest carried the sacrament into a house the Kuster must precede him with bell and lantern. Marriage of priests was permitted. The power of the Bishop was retained. A sketch

of this Order was presented to Luther for his approval and by him permitted to pass. He judged the free preaching of the Gospel, the evangelical teaching of penitence and faith, of justification and good works, the dispensing of the Supper in both forms, and the marriage of priests of so great worth that the Catholic remnants in the ceremonies might easily take care of themselves. "If your Lord the Kurfurst," wrote he, December 4, 1539, to Probst Buchholzer, "is not satisfied with one cope, then let him put on three like Aaron the High Priest; and if his grace the Kurfurst is not satisfied with his processional and the singing and ringing, then let him go seven times around as Israel did at Jerico; and if your Lord the Margrave has the desire, then let his Kurfurstly Grace go on ahead with leaping and dancing, with harp and symbol as David did before the Ark of the Lord. For such things, if kept from real abuses, give to or take from the Gospel nothing at all. Yet see that out of them be not made something necessary for salvation and the conscience thereby be bound."

We next come to the "Kallenberger Ordnung" of 1542. It consisted of four parts, of which the first had to do with teaching and doctrine, and is thus introduced: "Christian, permanent and in the Scriptures and Holy Fathers well grounded explanations and interpretations of the chief articles of our true old Christian religion given out in print for poor, plain pastors."

The work was done by Corvinus, and he had evidently before him the general line of thought of the preceding articles. But Corvinus is a master teacher and he has worked out this new Order with great clearness and sharp divisions and subdivisions. He puts first Scripture proofs, and next in order sets the ideal church fathers. God will have His Word alone preached. As to faith, it "is worked in us by the Spirit out of the Word as a real confidence in Christ and His promises, namely, that we have come to grace on account of His merit, shall receive forgiveness of sins and be justified before God." "All his sins are forgiven the believer out of grace, without addition of his own works, and the righteousness which is accepted with God for Christ's sake is given him." Expressly is the sola fide principle maintained.

"In matters of justification all works, also works of the law are excluded." "Yet good and proper Christian works are in no wise forbidden, but are to be most diligently taught according to

the manner of the Scriptures as fruits of Christian penitence." But only "what God Himself demands and asks of us to the honor of His name and the furtherance of His glory, that call we good works." An interesting statement after the manner of Luther follows as to the care of the poor: "Native, pious, poor, sick and delinquent persons shall be cared for. Foreign beggars and beggar-monks (and here one can see the touch of resentment against the begging friars of Peter's pence) are not to be suffered in the country; for we do not have God's command that lazy folks shall be supported to be a burden to the Church in their laziness. Rather saith the Scripture, 'If any will not work, neither let him eat.' 2 Thess. 3:10."

Following in the line of the preceding and like it with strong dependence on Melanchthon's "Visitation Articles" is the *Kalner Kirchenordnung*, or Reformation. It is composed of "simple thoughts upon which a Christian Reformation grounded in the Word of God is to be built," and was a brilliant defense of the new faith, against the prevailing scholastic Catholicism of Kolm. Preachers are taught "that all preaching is to be directed to our Lord Christ."

In the matter of justification, where the Osiardrian thought of the Brandenburg Order had said, "the Gospel brings Christ Himself truly into the believing heart," we have here Melanchthon's thought expressed, "when also the conscience, in terror before God's wrath comforts itself with the Gospel and knowledge of the Savior Christ and the gracious promise given on His account, so is the Holy Spirit there and works in this struggle a sure confidence and trust in the heart, so that the Holy Spirit is given to men through faith."

This is the only Order depending on Nurnburg which has an article on the Church. The idea of the "invisible church" is put in the background according to Melanchthon's later view, and all emphasis placed on the "visible church." The visible church and assembly of God in this life is the congregation who truly believe God's Word commanded us through Christ and the apostles, and who through the Holy Ghost are born anew." Good and bad are mixed. "God's Word and the Sacraments, although they be dispensed by sinful persons, are yet strong from the grace of God and the work of Christ."

The Church is to be known by three signs. These three ar-

ticles leave somewhat the Luther-Melanchthon type. First is the right teaching, pure doctrines as given by Christ and the apostles. Second, the right use of the sacraments which Christ ordained. Third, confession of the right teaching in calling upon God and in Christian discipline and obedience to the ministers.

Of the Supper, is taught according to the views of Melanchthon "that the Lord truly presents and gives His flesh and blood, through the service of the Church, in the Holy Supper with the visible signs bread and wine, not as food for the natural and temporal, but as food for the spiritual and eternal life."

In 1552 the "Mecklenberg Order" was published—an order how the procedure is to be—"As regards the Christian doctrines, dispensing of sacraments, ordination, orderly ceremonies in the Church, visitations, consistory and schools."

Its first part is concerning doctrines, in reference to which the articles say: "There is no other intention in the writing than that there shall be forwarded the one eternal true teaching of the Gospel which God has graciously revealed through His Son Jesus Christ which inheres in the writings of apostles and prophets, and which is expressed in the understanding of the Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, with which agree Luther's Catechism and Confession, (Reference here is to Luther's Confession of 1528 entitled, "The Confession of Articles of Faith against the enemy of the Gospel and all sorts of Heretics. Martin Luther) and the Augsburg Confession."

Justifying faith is at once a knowledge with regard to the articles of belief and holding the same as true, in which is enclosed the promise of the grace of Christ, to which all articles are directed as to an end, as well as "a truly hearty trust in the Son of God, Jesus Christ the Mediator and Reconciler, that we on His account and through Him have forgiveness of sins, grace and salvation."

The three signs of the true church are the pure teaching of the Gospel, the right use of the sacraments, and obedience to the preaching office.

There now follow the "Wurtemberg Order" of 1553; the "Pfalz-Neuburg" 1554; the "Sein-Wittgenstein" 1555; the "Waldeck" 1556; the "Saxon General Articles" 1557, and the "Pfalz-Zweihrucken" 1557.

In the first, by Brenz, the sacraments are discussed along Lutheran lines, and the doctrine of transubstantiation denied.

"The right understanding of the Scriptures is by Scripture itself, and by those who through Scriptures are awakened."

All of these last named Orders refer to the Augsburg Confession, some of them also to other Reformation articles, as the Apology, the Saxon Confession, Luther's Catechism, Melancthon's "Examination for the Ordained," the Schmalcald Articles, and Melancthon's "Locī Theologici."

"The Great Wurtemberg Church Ordnung" appeared in 1559, and was followed shortly by a series of others of like general character. The Wurtemberg Order was based on the Wurtemberg Confession of 1552, previously mentioned.

Previously in the Duchy of Prussia there began a trend toward a more positive Lutheranism. Its result was incorporated in the *Repetitio Corporis doctrinae ecclesiasticae*, or a "Repetition of the Sum and Content of the right general Christian doctrine as the same is drawn from the Word of God, set forth in the Augsburg Confession, Apology and Schmalcald Articles....." 1567.

Two Lutheran Bishops issued an Order in 1544 (Bishops Morlin and Venediger), an interesting feature of which is its preface, which declares that "Church Orders such as this are no necessary matters, and we are not thereby bound in our consciences; but they only serve toward a becoming discipline and good order."

A most weighty *Kirchenordnung* is that of "Braunschweig Luneberg" issued in 1569 by Duke Julius. This Order continued in use in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hanover up to 1900. It is the joint product of Superintendent Martin Chemnitz and Chancellor Jacob Andrea, and has great doctrinal value.

The basis of all Church Service is pure doctrine. It is taken from the Canonical Holy Scriptures, the Ecumenic Symbols (Apostolicum, Nicaeum, and Athanasianum) "for these same symbols are not outside of or antagonistic to the Scriptures, but are in their right, proper understanding, the very strength and sap of the Holy Divine Scriptures. Further the Augsburg Confession whose articles of the present time are right fine, pure, well founded symbols of the Evangelical Church, is to be received

according to the understanding of the Apology, the Schmalcald Articles, the Catechism and other writings of Luther."

Justification is defined "as the ranking doctrine of Christianity, which serves for the clear, right understanding of the entire Scriptures, and alone opens the door to the whole Bible, without which article, no poor conscience has a proper, permanent confidence or may know the riches of the Grace of God."

The sum of the pure doctrine is that "We are alone from grace righteous before God, on account of the obedience and death of Christ, through faith, without the addition of our renovation, obedience, or good works. The latter follow certainly, but they belong not to this article, how and by what means man is righteous before God and blessed." The objective ground of our justification lies alone in Christ "in order that the sole merit may be the obedience, sufferings and death of Christ, which out of pure grace is applied to us in Word and Sacrament alone through faith."

On the Sacrament, Chemnitz guards alike against Catholic and individualist. "We believe," continues Chemnitz, "what He says, but the 'modum' of its happening we commend to Him who has said it."

An interesting feature is the abbreviation of the Apostolic Creed by the omission of "conceived of the Holy Ghost," "suffered under Pontius Pilate," and "of God the Father Almighty." This is to be referred to inadvertence rather than dogmatic design.

Then follows the "Lippische Order" of 1571, the "Austrian" of 1571, the "Oldenberger" 1573, "Pommeranian" 1574, the "Hessian" 1574, "Luneberg" 1575, "Nassan, Sarbrücken" 1576, and the "Hohenhohe" of 1578.

In answer to the question, "What pertains then to the justification of the sinner before God?" the Oldenberg Ordnung reports, "There belong three things, neither without the other justifying man before God: First, the pure grace of God; second, the perfect obedience and merit of the Lord Christ; the third is faith."

In view of all this the children are accustomed to say in the Catechism:

"Gott giebt,
Christ erwirbt,

Der heilige Geist bestatigts.
Das Wort Verkundigts
Der Glaube empfangts
Die Sacramente versiegelen's
Gute Werke bezeugen's."

Finally we have the "Kursachsen Kirchenordnung" of the year 1580, the year of the Concordia. It is a work of Andrae. "God's Word is the norm, measure and rule according to which all church and school officials must always direct their preaching and teaching." It is to be explained in the understanding of the Augustana but "only by the first old invariata." "Owing to the many cloakings of impure teaching there is necessary a proper classification of all attacked doctrines."

This opens the door for the Formula of Concord and its carefully wrought-out definitions. The entire line of "Kirchenordnungen" discloses the processes and also largely the content of the later and more compacted Lutheran doctrinal statements.

Hanna Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

Our Lord instituted two sacraments, viz., that of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, corresponding to that of Circumcision and the Passover—the one the inductive, the other the commemorative rite of the Old Testament. To these the Roman Catholic and Greek churches added five others, viz., confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination and matrimony. The Lutheran, with the great body of Protestant churches, has been content with the Scriptural number.

And it may not come amiss to note the fact that no church in the Protestant Christian world has been so clearly marked by its distinctive fundamental doctrines as the Lutheran. It is therefore eminently proper that we understand what we mean by a sacrament before we proceed to discuss the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments.

The Council of Trent defined a sacrament thus: "A sacrament is something presented to the sense which has the power, by divine appointment, not only of signifying but also of conveying grace." Luther says "A sacrament is an observance appointed by God, in which one makes use of a visible thing, which has the divine Word of command and promise." Another has defined a sacrament as "a divine ordinance instituted by Christ in which by means of an outward and visible sign the purchased blessings of salvation are set forth, offered and sealed to those who are truly in covenant relation with Him." Another very simple definition is, "A sacrament is a visible element conveying invisible grace."

I. A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

Article IX of the Augsburg Confession, according to the German text, reads as follows: "Respecting baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that

children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God and become acceptable unto Him. Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned who teach that infant baptism is improper."

According to the Latin text of the Confession the statement is as follows: "Of baptism they teach that it is necessary unto salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor. They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without baptism."

Our Lord not only instituted the sacrament of baptism but commanded its administration to be continued, as recorded in the Gospel, (Matt. 28:19) "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And according to Mark (16:15, 16) it is written: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

As baptism was instituted by Christ, the Son of God, in the name of the Trinity, in connection with a divinely wrought-out plan of salvation it must be a divine institution.

The constituent elements of Baptism are water and the Word of God. As in nature things are constituted by the combination of elements, so in the plan of salvation administered by the Church, institutions are formed by the appropriation and union of natural and supernatural elements. In the constitution of baptism the natural element is water, the supernatural is the Word of God. "For," as Luther's Larger Catechism (p. 153) declares, "If the Word is separated from the water; it is not different from that used for ordinary purposes, and it may well be styled a common ablution; but when it is connected with the Word, as God ordained it, it is a sacrament, and is called a Christian baptism." And this is in perfect accord with the declaration of the Articles of Smalcald (Book of Concord, p. 299): "Baptism is nothing else, but the Word of God connected with water, commanded through His institution," or as Paul says (Eph. 5:26), "a washing of water by the Word."

The Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad, of sacred memory, has therefore

written (see LUTH. QUAR., Vol. IV, p. 479): "The wisdom of God is manifested in nature, by adapting certain elements for combination, and the same wisdom is exhibited by the adaptation of water and the Word to form a sacramental union. To the accomplishment of this end, it was necessary that water, which, as a natural element, was unfitted to enter into combination with the Word as a supernatural element, should be so changed by its appropriation to a religious end, as to be adapted for a union with the Word in the sphere of the supernatural. This adaptation the water receives through its consecration and use in baptism. In this manner it becomes an efficacious sign, a vehicle of truth, "a visible Word," analogous in its nature to the written Word. While the water, therefore, as a sign or symbol, reveals the depravity of man, and the necessity of regeneration, the Word enforces the command of God, and presents the promise of pardon, grace and salvation." The water and the Word thus united, applied and sanctified by the Holy Ghost become true baptism to the recipient.

Our Confession declares that through baptism the grace of God is offered. Quoting Dr. Conrad again: "By the grace of God are meant those moral and spiritual influences which God, out of pure favor, has introduced into our world, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, under whose operation man is induced to exercise faith in the Word and promises of God, through which he obtains remission of sins, becomes a new creature, and is recognized as an heir of eternal life. These gracious influences are exerted by the Holy Spirit, through the Word of God. And as we have seen that water, as a constituent element of baptism, by its appropriation to a sacramental purpose, becomes an efficacious sign, and as a "visible Word, united with a written or spoken Word, with which the Holy Spirit is united, and through which He operates, baptism becomes a means of grace co-ordinate with the Word of God. As grace is offered through the promise of the Gospel made in baptism, and when this promise is received by faith the grace of God is also conferred in baptism, and becomes efficacious in the justification, regeneration and salvation of the soul. And as children are to be baptized, grace is offered to them, as well as to adults, by baptism."

"Thus" (quoting myself from *Around The Home Table*, p. 76), "by baptism in the place of circumcision, children are

brought into covenant favor with God. Circumcision identified the children with the people of God. The uncircumcised child was ordered to be cut off. But by baptism they are brought into covenant favor with God, and hence become heirs of the promise. For (Acts 2:38, 39) it is written, "The promise is unto you and to your children." Let us not mistake however, baptism as regeneration itself. It is a means to that end. Paul in his letter to Titus (3:5) calls it "The washing of regeneration." Our Lord said (John 3:5), "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." But baptism is not regeneration itself—"ex opere operato"—as taught by some, but it is the means to that end." But if true baptism, properly administered, and truly received, regeneration becomes an assured fact.

While our Confession does not designate or describe the efficacy or benefits to the adult believers, the Smaller Catechism, in answer to the question (Q. 329, p. 95), "What are the benefits of baptism?" says, "Baptism works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare." And in answer to the question (Q. 332, p. 95), "How can water produce such great effects?" says, "*It is not the water, indeed, that produces these effects, but the Word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the Word of God connected with the water. For without the Word of God, water is simply water, and not baptism.*" But with the Word of God it is baptism, that is a gracious water of life, and a "washing of regeneration" in the Holy Ghost; as St. Paul says to Titus (3:5): "According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by His grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." That is to say that baptism, thus set forth, was regarded as a means of washing away original, and sealing the pardon of actual sin, as well as a means of imparting the Holy Spirit, through whose agency the soul is born anew and sanctified by faith in the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Not that the work is wrought "ex opere operato," but that the faith which lays hold upon the Word and promises of

God also received the Holy Ghost by whom the new creature is wrought out.

II. A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

There are three names applied to this sacrament, viz., the Eucharist, the Sacrament of the Altar, and the Lord's Supper.

Bishop Taylor observes that "a sacrament denotes an oath or vow, and that the Word has been applied with special emphasis to the Lord's Supper where the most sacred vows are renewed by the Christian in commemorating the death of His Redeemer. The term Eucharist denotes the giving of thanks...expressing grateful remembrance of Christ's suffering and death."

For a dogmatic statement of this sacrament we quote from "The Unaltered Augsburg Confession," Art. X, which reads as follows: "Concerning the Holy Supper of the Lord it is thus taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and there administered and received."

Luther (in the Larger Catechism, p. 164), gives us this definition or explanation of this statement of the Lord's Supper in answer to the question, "What is the Sacrament of the Altar?" "It is the true body of Christ our Lord, in and with bread and wine, commanded through the Word of Christ, for us Christians to eat and drink. And as we have said concerning Baptism, that it is not simple water, so we also say here, this sacrament is bread and wine, *but not mere bread and wine*, as taken to the table on other occasions, *but bread and wine comprehended in the Word of God, and connected with it*. It is the Word, I say, that makes and distinguishes this sacrament so that it is not mere bread and wine, *but is and is called, the body and blood of Christ*. For, * * when the Word is added to the external element, it becomes a sacrament."

The doctrine of the "Real Presence of Christ" in the Lord's Supper, as presented in this article of our Confession has been the chief point of controversy. And while the occasion of this controversy has been, in part at least, a war of words, there has been a vital difference of opinion in the interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and

perhaps also in part a failure to apprehend the deeper and more significant truth intended to be conveyed by our Lord in these statements.

The Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth (Conservative Ref. p. 599) amplifies the article thus:

1. "That the true body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects.
2. That the sacramental objects are truly present in the Lord's Supper.
3. That this true presence is under the form or species of bread and wine.
4. That present under this form or species they are communicated.
5. That thus communicated they are received by all communicants."

By the true body we mean that body in which our Savior was actually incarnate, as opposed to His mystical body, which is the Church. Eph. 1:22, 23; 5:32. Some minds have been confused also by the use of different adjectives descriptive of His body, such as "the natural body," and "the glorified" body of Christ. But in fact Christ's true body, His natural body, and His glorified body are one in identity. The only matter to be borne in mind is that the words "True" and "Natural" refer to its essence, while the word "glorified" refers to its condition. The glorification of His body neither made it cease to be true nor natural. That is, it was no more an unreal, ideal or imaginary body after its glorification than before. Hence the doctrine of the Lutheran Church that it was the true body which was given for us. For Christ, as He instituted the Lord's Supper said: "This is my body which is given for you." "Therefore," says Dr. Krauth, "the sacramental object must be His true body. For neither His mystical body, nor the Holy Spirit dwelling in His body, nor a sign or symbol of His body, could have been given for us, and that only can be the sacramental object."

By the true blood we mean that blood which was the actual life—the vitality and strength of His human body—that "precious blood" wherewith we are bought. We believe that it was His true blood which was shed for us for the remission of sins. For Christ said, "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for the remission of sins." In these words Christ did not

say, this is the efficacy of my blood, nor the Holy Spirit uniting us with His blood. nor yet that it was a sign or symbol of His blood, but simply and plainly, "This is my blood." Hence from the plain and very simple language of Him who instituted the Sacrament of the Altar we believe in the *Real presence* of the *true body* and *blood* of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Equally simple and plain also is the language of Paul (1 Cor. 10:16): "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

We do not believe, however,

1. That this presence consists of any such essential change of the elements of bread and wine into the body, flesh, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord, as that of the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. We do not believe that there is any conversion or transformation of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. But we believe that the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine, entirely unchanged in their properties and accidents, that is, in everything which constitutes them what they really are. Our Lord does not say, "Take, eat, this is my transformed body," or "this is my transformed blood." But simply, "*this is my body, this is my blood.*" Hence the bread in the Lord's Supper continues *real bread*, and the wine *real wine*. But both are means by which the body and blood of Christ are conveyed to us. Hence Paul in (1 Cor. 10:16) speaks of the visible elements in the holy sacrament as bread and wine. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the *blood of Christ*? The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the *body of Christ*?" Is there even an implied change or transformation of the wood of the vine into something else in its conveyance of sap, vitality, life from the ground through itself to the branches, thence into the foliage and fruit? And so Paul, by inspiration, has written of the bread and the cup.

2. We do not mean that the presence of the body and blood of Christ consists in any local or physical inclusion in the bread and wine, or of a commingling of them into one mass, such as belong to natural bodies. *We do not believe in any physical or local presence whatever.* The bread does not coalesce with the body, and the wine with the blood, into one substance. There

is no assumption of the elements into the humanity of Christ. Theologically this doctrine is called "Impanation," or "Consubstantiation," a doctrine which the Lutheran Church has always stoutly rejected, though unjustly charged with holding it. In the institution of the Lord's Supper, Christ did not say, "Take, eat; in this bread is included my body, or in this cup is included my blood." No, He did not say that. And although with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are communicated to us, we must not conceive the gross idea that the body and blood of Christ are locally enclosed in the elements.

3. We do not mean that in the Lord's Supper we partake of His body and blood by gross, carnal or natural eating or drinking. Evidently our Lord, when He said, "Take, eat, this is my body," * * and "this is my blood," did not wish to be understood in a natural, carnal sense, as if His disciples gathered around the table, were really to eat His living, natural body, or to drink His natural blood, then coursing through His veins. No, not that.

4. We do not believe that the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper consists in a mere figurative representation; that is, that the bread only represents, or signifies His body, and that the wine only represents, or signifies His blood. This is the other extreme and can not be accepted as scriptural from several considerations:

(1). This idea is opposed by the demands of all those types of the Old Testament which contemplate Christ as the Paschal Lamb, who is to be present in that nature in which He was slain, not after the shadowy mode of the old dispensation, but after the true mode of the new—in the New Testament Paschal. It is through His human nature that Christ is our Paschal Lamb sacrificed; and therefore it must be through His human nature that Christ our Paschal Lamb is eaten. If it was not through His divinity, separate from His humanity, that He was sacrificed upon the cross, it can not be that through His divine nature, separate from His humanity, He is given to us at His table.

(2). This idea is opposed by the demands of the type of the Old Testament sacrifices, which were not only to be offered to God, but to be partaken of by the priests and offerers. That body and blood which were offered to the Father, and by Him

accepted, must also be partaken of by those for whom they were offered, and the partaking must be a *true one*, as the offering itself was true. But in order to be a *true partaking* there must be a *true presence*.

(3). This idea is opposed by a proper translation of the original words of the institution. Our Lord did not say, this represents my body, but in the plainest and most simple language possible said, "*This is my body*" and "*This is my blood*." Nor does the Greek copulative, "eimi," by any proper translation mean to "represent," to "signify," or "is a symbol of." We base this declaration, (a) on the fact that no reputable translation, ancient or modern, has so rendered the word. No one of scholarship has ever dared to insert in the text of his translation, "this signifies," "represents" or "is a symbol of" my body. But if *eimi* means any or all of these, why have not some of our scholars—our lexicographers—given the public the benefit of their knowledge of this little word? The fact is, it simply means what it has always been translated—simply "is." (b) That no impartial dictionary of the Greek language, whether general or New Testament assigns any such meaning to the original "eimi." (c) That no standard dictionary of the English language assigns such a meaning to the English copulative "is" or "to be." But it simply means what it says. Hence the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, that the true body and blood of Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper, not in any such sense as above named, but in a *supernatural* and *incomprehensible* way. Even the late Dr. A. A. Hodge (Popular Lectures, p. 408) says, "It does not do to say that this presence is only spiritual, because that phrase is ambiguous. If it means that the presence of Christ is not something objective to us, but simply a mental apprehension or idea of Him subjectively present to our consciousness, then the phrase is false. Christ as an objective fact is as really present and active in the sacrament as are the bread and wine, or the minister, or our fellow communicants by our side."

But while we can not fully comprehend and explain how this is, can we not, in the province of faith, lay hold of the great truth, and by it, without the course of philosophical reasoning, accept our Lord's simple statement, "*This is my body*" and "*This is my blood*?" However a simple illustration from God's Word may aid in simplifying and impressing the idea in a meas-

ure at least. According to the Gospel of St. John (XV, 1-5) our Lord gave us the parable of the vine and the branches, which we will use as a practical illustration in this case. The vine planted in the ground, and communicating from it to the branches, represents Christ the only begotten of the Father, sent forth from Him. The branches in living connection with the vine represent all believers by faith engrafted into Jesus Christ, the Vine, and in living communion with Him. But now proper sustenance for the life is in the ground to be absorbed through the tiny pores of the roots and conveyed through the vine to the branches. The operation begins; the life flows; we see the buds, then the leaves, the blossoms, and the ripened fruit. Does any one question the *real presence*, in species and essence, of the vine in the branches? And can any one fully comprehend, and will he attempt a clear and simple explanation of just how it all came about? And as the vine becomes the medium of communication, are its visible parts in any wise changed into something else? In our conception of the process of the communication of life from the ground to the branches, must we think of "Transubstantiation" or of "consubstantiation?" O, no! "Folly! Folly!" would cry our natural philosophers. And yet, that which is communicated is the body—it is the very essence which composes and constitutes that body—the body of vine and branches. Precisely so with Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. We can no more fully comprehend and explain how He is communicated to us through the medium—the bread and the wine—than we can the process in the case of the vine and the branches. But does any one question the reality in the process in the vine because he can not fully comprehend and explain it all? Why then raise the question about the "*Real Presence of Christ*" in the Lord's Supper? Why not take Him at His Word when He says, "Take, eat, this is my body," "this is my blood." If we can not fully comprehend, why not believe? Shall we be guilty of limiting our faith to the bound of our reason? God forbid!

Boulder, Colo.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LUTHERAN USAGE OF LENT.

BY E. E. ORTLEPP, D.D.

The word *Lent* is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *lencten* which, like the German *Lenz*, signifies Spring, and in itself does not refer to the religious character of the season. The ecclesiastical meaning of Lent is expressed by the Lutheran *Passion* and the Roman Catholic *Fasts* (*Fastenzeit*). In the Lutheran sense, as the word indicates, Lent is that season of the Church Year which preeminently reminds the Christians of the sufferings of their divine Savior. It includes the cycle of 46 days preceding Easter, and is itself introduced by three preparatory Sundays.

The earliest traces of the Lenten season lead back to remote antiquity in the Church. The bizarre features of the Middle Ages proper may be safely passed by as unproductive of original contributions; for where an apparently new form appears, it is but an elaboration or distortion of the older, plainer, and better usage. To the Lutheran Church belongs the credit of having restored to Lent its original, inherent, and adequate conception as the season of the Passion.

I. THE ORIGIN OF LENT.

Dies stationum. These were Wednesday and Friday of each week, anciently observed as half-fast days by abstaining from food until 3 p. m., a custom probably derived from Judaism. The Pharisees fasted twice a week, namely, on Monday—because on that day Moses ascended Sinai,—and on Thursday—because he was said to have returned on that day. The Christians made a change at an early date. The *Διδαχὴ* 8,1 (about 150 A. D.) enjoins the Gentile Christians to hold their fasts, in opposition to "hypocrites," on Wednesday and Friday: *νηστείουσι γὰρ δευτέρα σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτη. ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευὴν* Both Irenaeus, who died between 190-200 A. D., and Tertullian (220?) mention these days, the latter stating that the fasts

were as yet *ex arbitrio, non ex imperio* (De jejun, 2). During the third century the two days were enjoined as fast days and distinguished with special church services, as seen in the Syrian Didaskalia 21, and Origen (In Lev. hom. 10.) In the fourth century the same rule was in effect (Apost. Can. 69), and Jerome (420) insists on the Lenten fast—centering in Wednesday and Friday—as an *apostolic* commandment. All this serves to show the antiquity, popularity, and stability of these two days.

Wednesday was chosen as reminding of the evil counsel and the bargain of the betrayer, while Friday commemorated the Lord's death; and whereas the ancient Church Year centered in the week, each week became a celebration of Christ's Passion, a repetition of Lent. Again, Easter was the highest Christian festival and the beginning of the Church Year, sufficient to endow the Wednesday and Friday before the feast of the Resurrection with special dignity, until the observance of two days expanded into a season covering several weeks. Excepting Easter, therefore, Lent was the first established cycle of the Church Year, with Wednesday and Friday standing forth as the pioneers.

The Quadragesima—τεσσαρακοστή=40 days. Several circumstances helped together to make the days and weeks of Lent a period of fasting. The surpassing prominence and influence of Easter in the growing Church demanded a preparation of corresponding solemnity. The general hope of Christ's second advent on Easter permeated the exercises with a spirit of serious devotion. The great joy of the Resurrection could not be conceived without contrasting it with the sorrowful time when the bridegroom of the Church was in the power of Death, days of mourning *in quibus ablatus est sponsus* (Tertul. de jejun, c. 13). Finally, the daily hardships and trials, particularly the increasing persecutions, induced the Christians to remember the more ardently the sufferings of their Lord, and they did so by adding day after day in which to express their fears or hopes through fasting and mourning. For a long time a marked diversity as to the duration of Lent prevailed. Irenaeus says that "some think they ought to fast for one day, others for two days, and others even for several, while others reckon forty hours both of day and night to their day." (Ep. ad Vict. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5, 24). "Irenaeus then goes on to say that this variety is not merely a thing of his own time, but of much older date; an important statement,

as carrying back the existence of the fast practically up to apostolic times." (Smith, Dict. Ant. 972). Rome seems to have favored three weeks, while Greece, Egypt and Palestine had six, and Constantinople seven. Despite these wide variations the fast was generally called τεσσαρακοστή, which indicates that stress was laid on the number forty. Indeed, the Christians connected it with the period during which Jesus was in the power of death, they wrongly estimating it at forty hours, from noon on Friday to 4 a. m. on Sunday. The number of *days* was suggested by the fasts of equal duration recorded of Moses, Elias, and our Lord in the wilderness. The maximum of forty days is thought to have been definitely fixed by Gregory the Great (604).

Ancient Observance. The ante-paschal or quadragesimal fast was from the beginning, and afterwards, in the Western Church, remained, the most prominent of the five stated fasts. Forbidden on Sundays throughout the Church, the fast was very strict during Lent, lasting from morning until evening, as Ambrose (de Elia Jejun. 10) and Chrysostom (Hom. 6 et 8 in Gen.) inform us, and requiring total abstinence from food. The prevailing idea of the Lenten fast was not the general one, attaching to all similar exercises, namely, to quicken zeal and to aid devotion, but rather the definite one of preparing oneself for the approaching Easter and the coming Christ, to please and imitate the Lord: *Invenimus enim in quodam libello ab apostolis dictum, Beatus est qui etiam jejunit prae eo ut alat pauperem. Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est epud Deum et revera digne satis: imitatur enim Illum qui animam suam posuit pro fratribus suis.* (Origen, Hom. in Lev. 10). The immediate occasions to sustain the zest in fasting were, for the church members, the great Easter-communion, always considered of exceptional prominence; for the catechumens, the solemn Easter-Baptism; and for the penitents seeking readmission, the generous Easter-Absolution.

During Lent the number of services was increased and sermons were delivered daily. Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* were such Lenten sermons. The catechumens were carefully instructed (Augustine, sermo 210), for they had to present themselves at least forty days before Baptism, as the Roman bishop Siricius (399) stipulated. Of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (351-86), there are seventeen lectures extant, delivered to his

catechumens during Lent. Scripture lessons were selected and read with reference to the character of the season. In the Oriental churches Genesis was read and expounded to contrast the *Creation* of the world with the *Redemption* of the world, the beginning of the *Old* with the beginning of the *New*. Chrysostom did so in Antioch and met the same custom in Constantinople where he continued to preach on Genesis. In the Occident the books of Job and Jonah furnished lessons and texts, as Ambrose testifies; Job was the type of the suffering Savior, while Jonah caused the repentance of Nineveh and with his stay in the belly of the whale prefigured the buried and rising Lord. Nebe, Ep. I, 29 f. The account of Christ's Passion was in all churches reserved for Holy Week. The themes diligently preached and the works earnestly demanded of the hearers were castigation of the body, chastity, temperance, repentance and forgiveness. Jerome, in the preface to his *comes*, justifies his choice of lessons for Lent as being in conformity to the customs of the Church, texts treating in *capite quadragesimae de abstinentia escarum et sobrietate, de poenitentia, de pudicitia, de remissione inimicitiarum*. Nebe Ep. II, 4. Thus the Church observances bore the pronounced character of penitence, which found its sternest expression in the order of the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 365), prohibiting all things of a festal nature in Lent, confining even the celebration of festivals of the martyrs and the oblation of bread and wine in the Sacrament to Saturdays and Sundays.

As the influence of Christianity rose in the community, and especially after the Church had been recognized by the State, the world-denying spirit of the Lenten solemnities overstepped the boundaries of the congregation and asserted itself also in public life. All forms of social enjoyment were at first frowned upon and then forbidden. Public games, theatrical shows, and noisy entertainments had to cease, and where they were beyond the control of the Church, the Christians were warned against participating in them. Chrysostom, in two Lenten homilies (*Hom. VI et VII in Gen. c. 1*), preaches against the horse-races and points to the scandal caused by Christians who attend them. In a canon (52), which probably forms an exception as to strictest regulation, the Council of Laodicea forbade all celebrations of marriages and even birthday festivals in Lent. The ecclesi-

astical as well as the civil law honored the holy season. "The Council of Nicaea (325) appoints Lent as one of the two periods in the year for the sitting of a synod of the bishops of the province to revise the sentence of excommunication inflicted by any of their number in the preceding season, as a check upon undue severity." Dict. Ant. 975. A law (A. D. 380) of the Theodosian code prohibited the hearing of criminal cases during the quadragesimal days. Ambrose states that death sentences were not issued; according to him imprisoned debtors were released, at least in the week before Easter: *solebant debitorum laxari vincula. Ep. 20, 6*. The severity of penal procedure was generally relaxed, the infliction of corporeal punishment, as the torturing of robbers, being interdicted. As if the earliest dawn of Easter were, weeks in advance, discernible on the horizon and prompted the believers to let their wretched brethren share in expectant joy!

We turn now to a review of the Lenten season as it was completed about the end of the fifth century.

II. THE LENTEN SEASON.

Three Introductory Sundays. These are called Septuagesimae, Sexagesimae and Quinquagesimae, the very names making their relation to Lent obvious if we remember that the Lenten fast was called Quadragesima. When the beginning of the Church Year was transferred from Easter to an earlier date, many churches selected Septuagesimae as the ecclesiastical New Year's Day. Thereby, instead of being slighted, Easter was all the more exalted, since now even its preparatory cycle claimed longer duration and profounder importance. The circumstance that Lent looks backward and appropriates the three preceding Sundays, is due to the varied styles of counting the forty days. In some parts the Sundays only were exempt from the fastings, while frequently the Saturdays and, occasionally, even the Thursdays were also exempted, with the result that the forty fast days proper were spread over six, seven, and as many as nine weeks. As stated already, Gregory the Great (542-604) is generally thought to have established uniformity by enacting that Lent should consist of the forty-six days preceding Easter, an arrangement which, since the six Sundays are not counted as fast days, se-

cures the compact Quadragesima. Therefore, those three Sundays did not become neutral territory between Epiphany and Lent, but assumed an introductory and preparatory office to the Lenten season.

Consequently, on *Septugesimae* (κυριακή πρὸ τῆς ἀποκρίω) the "fasts of the clergy" began in distinction from the "fasts of the people" which commenced on Ash Wednesday. The Hallelujah in the Mass was omitted, and no weddings were performed. The catechumens assembled for the first time to receive instruction. On *Sexagesimae* (τῆς ἀποκρίω, the Sunday of the carnival) the clergy ate flesh for the last time; the so-called *Butter-week* began, when butter, cheese, milk, and eggs were permitted, a diet once more restricted on *Quinquagesimae* (τῆς τυροφάγος, the Cheese-eater), and again on Ash Wednesday.

Ash Wednesday. The name originated in the rite of burning palm leaves—consecrated on Palm Sunday of the previous year—and the benediction of the ashes, a ceremony which the priest was allowed to perform only in the absence of the bishop. "The priest or bishop, after blessing the ashes, sprinkled them with holy water, and they were then received from his hand by the clerics and laymen present." Dict. Ant. 977. With the ashes the sign of the cross was made on the forehead of the worshipper, as a symbol of repentance, accompanied with the warning words based on Gen. 3, 19, and Apoc. 2, 5: *Memento, homo, quia cinis es, et in cinem reverteris; age poenitentiam, et prima opera fac.* Ash Wednesday ushered in the general and vigorous Lenten fast, wherefore it is also known as *caput jejunii*: Throughout the season "all amusements were stopped, all criminal trials rested, and the din of traffic in streets and markets as far as possible restricted." Kurtz, Ch. H. I, 356. The Gelasian Sacramentary ordained that the penitents be taken early on this day, clothed in sack-cloth, and put into seclusion until Maundy Thursday, when reconciliation took place.

Sundays in Lent. Though not observed as fast days, the six Sundays in Lent were diligently employed to impress the people with the necessity of fasting and mourning. The Old Church gospel on *Invocavit*, Matt. 4, 1-11, was chosen on account of Christ's fasting in the wilderness, and its homiletical use is thereby indicated. On *Reminiscere* the devil vexing the daughter of the woman of Canaan, Matt. 15, 21-28, illustrated the sad

bondage from which the world must be freed. On *Oculi*, also known as *dies scrutinii*, *dominica abrenunciationis*, or *dom. exorcismi*, the catechumens were thoroughly examined before the assembled congregation, and the devil was exorcised, all his pomp and works being renounced by the catechumens. The names of sponsors for the Easter-baptisms were handed in to the clergy on this day, or latest on the following Sunday. *Laetare* brought a note of rejoicing into the somber celebrations, for those who had renounced the devil now formally and publicly surrendered themselves to the Lord as the first fruit of his Passion, wherefor this Sunday was known as *dom. redemptionis ab idolatria*. From the Monday after *Laetare* to the following Sunday the week-day lessons, with but one exception, were taken from the gospel of St. John, in order to show forth the enmity of the Jews against Christ. *Júdica* was originally, as seen in the Gregorian Sacramentary, the Passion Sunday, the Sunday of the Cross: *dom. passionis*, or *dom. de cruce*, but gradually that name passed over to *Palmarum*.

Palm Sunday. This day gained its distinction from the very ancient and interesting observance in Jerusalem, which commemorated the Entry of the Lord. At first the Occident seems to have paid no attention to the entry on this day, rather ordering the Passion according to St. Matthew to be read in the service, which led to shifting the name Passion Sunday from *Júdica* to *Palmarum*. But Gregory Nyssen (between 394-398?) already mentions the Palm Sunday processions as part of the celebrations in the East and West, and at the end of the seventh century the carrying of palm branches was universally practiced. On this Sunday the Apostolicum was confided to the neophytes found worthy of baptism to learn it by heart during the coming week. In Gall, as Isidore of Sevilla (570?-636) states, the Sunday was called the *capitalavium*, because the catechumens had their heads washed so as not to come dirty to the baptism on Easter. This custom certainly antedates Isidore's time, since long before him bathing was forbidden during Lent, excepting on Maunday Thursday, and the mere dictates of cleanliness must have demanded something like a *capitalavium* in certain cases which made the Maunday bath impracticable. Palm Sunday is also called Indulgence Day (Jerome), because the emperors released prisoners and the courts of justice remained closed dur-

ing the ensuing week. As a token of mourning at the opening of Holy Week, the Gloria Patri was silenced in the services, though, generally, Palm Sunday was a day of gladness.

Holy Week. Beginning with Palm Sunday—in the Greek Church with Monday,—Holy Week brought on the culmination of the great Lenten Preparation with Good Friday, introduced by Maunday Thursday, as the climax. The high esteem in which this week was held by the ancient Church is seen in the names. The *Constitutiones apost.* 8, 33, toward the close of the third century, call it ἡ ἑβδομάς μεγάλη, and speak of its universal acceptance at that time. So also Chrysostom, for instance in his *Hom.* 30 c. 1 in *Gen. X et XI*. In the fourth century the week was universally called *hebdomas magna, septimana major*. The term *sancta* was also occasionally employed, but has almost exclusively become the property of the Protestants in their "Holy Week." In the Roman Church the official name today is *hebdomada magna* or *major*. In German the week is called *Charwoche* i. e., "week of mourning," or *Stille Woche*=quiet week. Its observance belongs to earliest antiquity and can be traced back to almost apostolic times. Besides the *Constitutions* already mentioned, and previous to them (about 260 A. D.), Dionysius of Alexandria attests its universal acceptance, while the still earlier statements of Irenaeus and Tertullian, cited in the first part of this article, refer to this week particularly. The primitive fast, at first extending over two or three days, gradually occupied the entire week, commencing with midnight on Palm Sunday, and ending at cockcrow on Easter. Throughout the week the diet was restricted to bread, salt, and vegetables, with water as a beverage. This plain fare was not to be eaten before 3 p. m. or evening, while total abstinence was enjoined on Friday and Saturday, or at least on Saturday. Special mortifications were engaged in, such as sleeping on the ground, strict continence, watchings, and xerophagy. Epiphan. Haeres 75, 3. The rich liturgical celebrations of the West rested mainly on the ancient customs in vogue at Jerusalem where the Holy Week naturally was of peculiar significance. A Spanish lady, Egeria, has recorded the services witnessed during her visit at Jerusalem (about 385 A. D.) in the *Peregrinatio Silviae*, c. 30-37, of which an interesting sketch is found in PRE³ 21, 415-422. The spirit of leniency which permeated the whole Lenten season flowed from

the sacred source of this week. The councils forbade work and laid stress on singing hymns and participation in services. The clergy instructed the people to remember the poor, and rich alms were brought; they admonished the masters to grant their slaves rest from secular work and to give them time for instruction in the Church; they implored the magistrates to guard the sanctity of the week, and upbraided or praised them as they deserved. Gregory of Nazianzum (Ep. 112) censured a judge for permitting spectacles during a feast. Ambrose eulogizes the younger Valentinian (*De Obitu Valentin. Consolatio*) for having refused a sentence of death during a holy season. Chrysostom refers directly to this week in his *Hom. in Gen. 30*: "Not we alone do honor this week, but also the emperors of our continent have distinguished it for good cause by granting vacation to all who manage municipal affairs, that they may use these days devoting them to divine service. For this reason the gates of the courts are closed that, mark well, all traffic and every kind of quarrel and of punishment may rest." Comp. Nebe Ev. II, 2. The Scriptures were not neglected. In the ordinary services the choice of lessons was casual and depended largely on the judgment of the clerics, but the daily services of the great week had their annually recurring texts at an early date. The offering of Isaac was a favorite passage. The book of Job was consecutively read in the Alexandrian Church, as Origen testifies: *In conventu ecclesiae in diebus sanctis legitur passio Iobi, in diebus.....in quibus in jejuniis et abstinentia sanctam domini nostri Jesu Christi passionem sectamur.* (*Hom. in Job 1*). The same custom prevailed in the Milan Church under the episcopate of Ambrose as he tells his sister Marcellina: *andistis librum Job legi, qui solemniter munere est ecursus et tempore* (*Ep. 20 ad Marcellin*). The prophet Jonas and Genesis were also used, especially the latter; the homilies in the *Hexameron* were delivered in Holy Week. Particularly the account of Christ's Passion was reserved for this week. The general practice seems to have been to begin with Matthew's account on Palm Sunday ending with John's narrative on Good Friday. However, some congregations as, for instance, that of St. Augustine's, insisted on hearing the Passion read from but one gospel on one day: *Passio autem, quia uno die legitur, non solet legi nisi secundum Matthaeum. Volueram aliquando, ut per singulos annos secundum omnes evan-*

gelistas etiam passio legeretur: factum est, non audierunt homines, quod consueverant, et perturbati sunt. (Aug. sermo 232 in dieb. Pasch feria quarta Pasch.) Again somewhat different was the rule in the Church of Antioch, concerning which Chrysostom (*in princ. act. hom. 4.*) says that on Good Friday was read τὰ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάντα, and on Saturday, ὅτι παρεδόθη ἡμῶν ὁ κύριος, ὅτι ἐσταυρώθη, ὅτι ἀπέθανε τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὅτι ἐτάφη.

Maundy Thursday. As the entire week, so also this day had its original observance in Jerusalem from where it found its way into the Western churches. The name is undoubtedly a corruption of *dies mandatum*, derived from the antiphon *Mandatum novum do vobis, ut diligatis invicem, John 13, 34.* Others, however, derive it from the *maunds* or *baskets* in which gifts of charity were brought and freely distributed among the poor on that day. The ancient appellation *dies viridium* seems to have originated from the custom of eating green bitter herbs on the Passover, which would also explain the German *Gruen Donnerstag*; to this day something green is found on the dinner table of German Lutherans on Maundy Thursday. While the ordinary Thursdays in Lent had no public worship, Maundy Thursday had rich services and diversified exercises. It was the only day in the year when the Lord's Supper was celebrated without previous fasting. If at some early period the agape was ever connected with the Sacrament of the Altar, then later Maundy Thursday was the only day of the year that the practice took place in commemoration of the Institution. The Council of Carthage (A. D. 397) forbade fasting on this day: *Ut sacramenta altaris nonnisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur excepto uno die anniversario quo coena Domini celebratur*; however, this order was revoked by the Council of Constantinople (691) on the ground that the preceding agape was not conducive to an appropriate celebration of the Lord's Supper. The main feature of the day was the commemoration of the institution of the Lord's Supper, wherefor this Thursday was generally known as the *Coena Domini*. The celebration was held in the morning, in some places also in the evening, as in the African Church, in others, three masses were customary. The Trullan Council (692) revised the order of the previous year and, on account of serious abuses, prohibited the evening celebrations altogether. The rite of washing the feet before communion encountered a

changeable fate. Augustine in his Ep. ad Januarium attests its practice on Maundy Thursday. It was generally observed in Milan, Gaul and Spain, and yet as early as A. D. 306 forbidden by the Council of Elvira while, on the contrary, the Council of Toledo (694) excluded from communion all who refused to wash their feet or to have them washed on this day. Augustine, in his Ep. ad Januarium, speaks of catechumens bathing the whole body for the sake of cleanliness anent the approaching baptism: *quia baptizandorum corpora per observationem quadragessimae sordidata cum offensione sensus ad fontem tractarentur, nisi aliquo die lavarentur.* (Ep. 118-119 c. 18.) In a number of churches the candidates for Baptism were required to recite the Creed which had been entrusted to them on Palm Sunday. The solemn absolution of the penitents took place: *Erat dies quo Dominus sese pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia poenitentialia relaxantur* (Ambrose, ep. ad Marcellin.) His probation being ended, the penitent sought public readmission by casting himself down before the congregation; the psalm *Miserere* was sung, and prayers were said over the prostrate penitent, whereupon he partook of the holy Sacrament. In the fifth century the chrism, needed in large quantities for the baptisms, was consecrated, as also the oil for anointing the sick. Other features were expressive of mourning, as the silencing of the bells from midnight on Wednesday until the matins on Easter, or the stripping of the altar and the extinguishing of the lights after the vesper. At 3 p. m. a candle was lit without the church and carried in procession through the congregation into the sacristy, where from the candle a lamp was kindled to be left burning until Saturday morn. The solemnity of the day affected also the non-Christian element. At first the Christians were forbidden to associate with the Jews; after the Church was in power, the Jews were prohibited to appear in public or to mingle with Christians from Maunday Thursday until Easter Monday. As a matter of mere curiosity, mainly of benefit to such as believe in an enlightened pope, let it be added that the *Constitutio Apostolicae sedis* of Oct. 12, 1869, which pretended to abolish the infamous *Bulla in coena domini*, is practically a repetition of that bull which, on every Maunday Thursday, condemned all heretics among whom Luther and his adherents are mentioned with emphasis! PRE^s, 3, 536.

Good Friday.—Originally there was no separate observance of this day, for the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were celebrated together on and as *The Great Pascha*: Easter. Soon, however, the term *Die Pascha* was applied to Good Friday, as we learn from Tertullian who speaks of the fast *die Paschae*, our Good Friday, as *communis et quasi publica jejunii religio*. (*de Orat.* 18.) After the time of Leo I (390?-461) the two events were separated, Friday being the *πάσχα στανρώσιμον* in distinction from the *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*. "The day was observed as a strict fast, (*Syr. Didask.*, 21. *Apost. Const.* 13), continued by those who could endure it beyond midnight of the following day. . . . The kiss of peace was prohibited. (Where it had not been done already on Maundy Thursday), the altar was stript of its ornaments, and even of its coverings. The lamps and candles were gradually extinguished during matins. A long series of intercessory collects was used. A cross was erected in front of the altar, blessed, and adored. There was no celebration of the Lord's Supper, but the reserved eucharist of the previous day was partaken of by the faithful." *Dict. Ant.* 738. The host of the so-called *missa praesantificatorum* was not "partaken of by the faithful." The priest with the entire clergy in procession brought the host on Good Friday from the side altar to the main altar where a shortened and modified liturgy was held. The host, broken into three parts of which one was cast into the chalice, was eaten by the priest alone. Drews, in *PRE*³ 21, 425. At the services the account of the Passion was read; in Jerusalem, from the gospel of St. John (*Pereg. Silv. c. 36.*), in the other Eastern Churches, from the four gospels, and in the West, from Matthew. In the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries there were numerous churches in which no communion was held on Good Friday, and in the first half of the seventh century the custom prevailed in Spain to omit services altogether, keeping the doors of the churches locked as a token of profound mourning. The Council of Toledo (A. D. 633), protested against that habit and ordered that, at least, sermons on the death of Christ be delivered.—The liturgical name among the Latin Christians is *Parasceve*=Preparation; among the Greeks, ἡ μεγάλη παρασκευή. The Greek designation "holy Friday" is preserved in the French *vendredi saint* and in the Italian *venerdì santo*. In German the popular name is *Karfreitag*=the sad Friday. The expression

guter Freitag, the same as the English "Good Friday" is still used in some parts of Germany and was quite frequent in the sixteenth century; it is found in the Brandenburg Order of 1540.

Saturday, the Great Sabbath, τὸ μέγα σάββατον, *Sabbatum magnum*, which in the Greek Church is considered of greater dignity than even Good Friday. It bore a two-fold character: the penitential, as the conclusion of Lent; and the jubilant, as the prelude of the Resurrection. The day was kept as a strict fast both East and West, the only Saturday of the year so distinguished. The fast lasted frequently until cock-crow on Easter morn, but the rule was to break it on mid-night for, as Jerome and Lactantius reason, as Israel was delivered at mid-night, so the return of the triumphant Lord may be expected at the same hour. The main feature was the great vigil, celebrated in a solemn manner, and at an early date. Tertullian mentions it (*ad ux. II*). It was considered an apostolic order. The Syrian Didaskalia give a good account of the vigil. The people met at 3 p. m. The service consisted of prayer and supplication, of intercession especially for the Jews. Numerous Scripture lessons followed. Where the reading of the Passion had begun on Friday, as in Antioch, it was finished in this service. As the night progressed the signs of mourning were laid aside and the expectant looking for the Lord increased. The agape with the eucharist followed. In the main, the same observance remains in the fourth and fifth centuries. It was the most solemn vigil of the year called by St. Augustine *mater omnium sanctorum vigilarum* (*Serm. 219*). It was the night of numerous baptisms. On the Easter eve following Chrysostom's deposition 3000 catechumens were scattered by the soldiery of Constantinople, as they awaited the administration of the sacrament. Despite all watchfulness of the deacons scandalous incidents seem to have been unavoidable in that night, and with the sixth and seventh century vigils were confined to the afternoon. While at the height of its glory, about the fourth century, the night of the vigil was resplendent with many lamps and candles. Eusebius (*de Vit. Const. 4, 22*) records that Constantine suspended lamps and set up huge waxen tapers as big as columns throughout the city. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat. de Pasch. 42*) relates how magistrates and high-born ladies carried lamps, and set up tapers at home or in churches. From this originated about A. D. 417, the solemn blessing of the

paschal taper which was lighted from newly struck and blessed fire, carried in procession before the catechumens, placed before the altar, and left burning until after the mass on Easter.

III. LENT IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

No Roman ritualism, no modern innovation: Such is the striking impression which our short review, stopping at the dark portals of the Middle Ages, gives us of Lent. In our observance of that season we betray not the faintest inclination to imitate papal ceremonies and superstitions, but rather join hands, if not with the apostles themselves, then with their immediate pupils and successors. We feel the warmly beating pulse of our brethren in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Carthage, in Constantinople, in Rome, in the entire ancient Church at the best period of fiery trials and dearly bought victories. The history of Lent is written with the heart-blood of our forefathers. Lent was not artificially made, but grew spontaneously out of ardent love to Christ, out of sincere worship, out of the sad and glad experiences of the ancient Christians. It is an integral part of the organism, the work, and the hope of the Church. All the more sublime, then, to see the light of the Lutheran Reformation shine backward into the earliest centuries and restore to us in full beauty that which no fasts or penances, no local or individual traits could suppress, that of which mediaeval papism had completely deprived the world: The Suffering Savior and His Cross. To have helped these cardinal truths to supreme rule during Lent, remains the merit of Lutheran influence.

Luther's Position. That his attitude toward Lent was at first indifferent, if not hostile, is scarcely surprising. It is readily explained through the deplorable conditions that met him all around, and which animated him with a three-fold objection. In the first place, the *mediaeval rites* of the Roman Church appeared to him absurd. Lenten sermons had been in vogue in Germany since early in the fifteenth century. Frequently series of such Fast-sermons—*Fastenpredigten*—were preached on subjects like the Prodigal Son, Noah's Ark, etc. The ancient epistles and gospels were rarely expounded, and then only in that emblematic style later so notorious. (*Zoeckler, Handbuch, III, 296*). Somewhat different were the so-called "Passion sermons," generally of an epic character, relating the sufferings of Christ, il-

illustrated with detailed and ridiculous anecdotes and explanations. This particular style emanated from the Passion-plays which were then performed throughout Europe. During the delivery of that class of sermons a cross was erected, a custom introduced by the peddlers of indulgences (Tetzel's Journeys!). What our Reformers thought of such practices is seen in Art. XV of the Apology, where they say: "In many countries, as in Italy and Spain, our adversaries have no preaching throughout the year excepting in Lent. . . . And even when they preach in Lent, they teach nothing but human ordinances, speaking of calling on the saints, of blessed water, and similar foolishness." Secondly, the *spiritual harm* done to the people through the Roman fasts was keenly felt by Luther. Because he himself taught and practiced the voluntary, scriptural fasting, his indictment of the Roman abuse is the more forceful. In the Church Postil he comments on the gospel of Invocavit, Matt. 4, 1-11: "This gospel is read today at the beginning of Lent that the example of Christ be pictured to the Christians and the fasts may be kept, which is nothing but apish buffonery." (*lauter Affenspiel*). In the Hauspostille, preaching on the gospel of Reminiscere, Matt. 15, 21-28: "This is a grand gospel, but they have appointed it for this Sunday, like others, because in it we read of driving out a devil. They want to indicate thereby that one ought to become pious and go to confession. But it is a bad and popish piety which can be stored up for the whole year and consists in miserable fasting and unwilling confession, of which there is no commandment." Now the scandalous system of indulgences was closely connected with the fasts, and the evils resulting therefrom had driven him into the Reformation: Is it surprising that he looked upon Lent without kindly interest? Luther's third objection touched the *social and economic* welfare of the people. The immense number of holidays imposed on the nation by the mediaeval Church, and on which no secular work was permitted, entailed a vast loss to the working classes and caused much unnecessary expense for feasting and carousing. Luther's aim was to abolish all superfluous holidays. In his sermon on Good Works, dedicated to Duke John of Saxony, on March 29, 1520, he says: "Would to God, that christendom had no holiday excepting Sunday, that the feast 'Of Our Lady' and 'All Saints' were all transferred to Sunday; then

many bad habits (*Untugend*) would be avoided, and through the work of the week-days the countries would not be so impoverished. But now we are burdened with many feasts to the detriment of souls, body, and possessions." In his pamphlet addressed to the German nobility, he pleads for the abolition of holidays giving as a cause the "bad habits" consisting in drunkenness, gambling, idling, and all manners of sin with which the feasts were abused. So opposed was he to the malpractice involved that in the *formula missae* of 1523, although wishing for daily services, he did not mention any observance of Lent, nor even of the Holy Week or Good Friday. But this man with the keen judgment and open mind for all that was genuine, valuable, and lasting, in the Christian Church, soon began to show interest in Lent and with his example pointed to the right celebration of Lent as we find it in our Church.

Reformatory Influence. The Reformation abolished at once the endless ceremonies of the Roman Lent; which did not hinder Luther to recognize the importance of the genuine Lenten idea which he discovered first in the Holy Week. The daily services held throughout the year were not omitted in the week before Easter and it was but natural that in its services the Passion of the Lord claimed attention. Luther, therefore, retained the—voluntary—fast of Palm Sunday and Holy Week, he learned to observe Good Friday as a holy day, and to distinguish also Maundy Thursday with sermons. He called Holy Week the *Marterwoche*, *Charwoche*, *Palm week*. In 1521 and 22 Luther preached on Maundy Thursday on the worthy reception of the Lord's Supper, and on Good Friday on the Passion in general. The mode of observing Holy Week in Wittenberg about 1526 is seen in Luther's "German Mass." The *Marterwoche*—"Week of Suffering"—shall be like any other week except that the Passion be preached, one hour a day, throughout the week, or as many days as one chooses, and that those who will may take the Sacrament." If there are communicants, the Sacrament shall be administered, but secular work is not forbidden; this was recommended to the entire Arch Duchy of Saxony, but the preaching on the Passion was not made compulsory. (The Wittenberg Order of 1533). This same document prescribes two sermons each on "Good Wednesday," Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Saturday. If we bear in mind that Luther objected only to

superfluous holidays, and that he never counted Good Friday or Maunday Thursday as such; that he himself distinguished these two days; and that since 1528 he was in favor of retaining the more important feast days, as Christmas, Circumcision, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and several others with Biblical foundation; then we realize that the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries acted in his spirit when choosing Holy Week and the whole Lenten season for increased but voluntary services in which the Passion of Christ was paramount, leaving details to local requirement.

Thus the Brandenburg Orders of 1540 and 1572 retained the procession on Palm Sunday. On the following days the Passion according to the four gospels was read. Where foot-washing had been customary in pre-reformatory time, it was practiced on Maunday Thursday followed with a sermon on the Lord's Supper in the evening. On Good Friday the Passion season was concluded with the celebration of the Sacrament of the altar. Of peculiar nature were the Lenten examinations generally introduced in the second half of the sixteenth century, held in order to hear what the servants and children knew of the Passion. In 1580 the Sundays in Lent were used for that purpose throughout Saxony. During the Thirty Years' War they fell into oblivion, but were revived by the pietists. Spener particularly attracted old and young, rich and poor, to his catechizations held in Dresden. In Sweden such examinations are frequent to this day, where they follow the Lenten sermon and have as topics the Passion of Christ or doctrines like Redemption, Atonement, etc. The examinations last from thirty to forty-five minutes, the minister asking the whole congregation, and whoever will or can does answer him.

Lent at the present day. The aim of the Reformation to bring Christ crucified before the people during Lent, has been well accomplished in the Lutheran Church. Throughout the Lenten season week-day services are held in Lutheran countries, with special meditations, anthems, and liturgies to glorify the cross of Christ, and these services are always well attended in the Old Country, in many regions even better than the regular Sunday services. Everywhere in Lutheran countries Good Friday bears the character of a day of repentance, and is a civil holiday on which no work is done. Maunday Thursday is generally ob-

served as a half-holiday, with communion in the morning or evening. In some parts of Germany Holy Week is closed to marriages, while in strictly Lutheran regions the whole Lent is a *tempus clausum*, music, shows, dancing, public amusements, and weddings are not allowed. Among the Lutherans of America the Lenten idea has also found favor, is advocated in its classic purity and carried out in a practical manner. The *Lutheran Cyclopaedia* under "Lent" says, p. 275: "Beginning with Ash Wednesday special services are held on Wednesdays, sometimes also on Fridays, at which the Passion history is read and explained and the liturgical services emphasize the work and sufferings of Christ. The general themes at these services are the doctrine of true repentance and the story of Christ's Passion. But Sundays retain their festival character and present Christ in His victorious power. Fasting is commended by some, but belongs entirely to the realm of evangelical freedom. In some city churches services are held every day in Lent." On the same subject, p. 110: "It is contrary to the genius of the gospel to lay down strict rules for the observance of this season. It is enough that the Church should make use of increased opportunity for instruction, that we should abstain from distractions, that we should exercise ourselves in self-denial both for our own sakes and the edification of others, and that all diligence should be given to prepare the catchumens for confirmation and all for the Easter communion. To this end the constant subject of meditation is the voluntary humiliation of our Savior." The Common Service recognizes the season by silencing the Hallelujah in the Sunday liturgy, while in some of our German churches the Gloria Patri also ceases, for which as a substitute the Agnus Dei is taken in one form or another. Where the liturgical colors adorn altar and pulpit, *violet* or *purple* or *black* reminds the worshipper at once of the solemnity of season and service. It may be said that the Church Year knows of no better time to sow the seed of the Word into the hearts, than Lent with its ardent, scriptural, impressive services in which song, prayer, lesson, and sermon center in the Cross of Christ; any revival is flat and stale in comparison with such Lutheran service.

To summarize: The Lutheran Lent is that season of the Church Year which in its purity originated and gradually developed among the earliest Christians, pre-eminently as a com-

memoration of Christ's Passion and preparation for Easter. In the course of centuries its genuine character was lost in numberless fasts, ceremonies, commandments, and superstitions of Roman Catholicism. The Lutheran Reformation has restored its true significance by again putting the Cross into the foreground, and has thereby carried out the intentions and fulfilled the hopes of our forefathers in Jerusalem, Antioch, and other ancient churches. In its plain yet comprehensive form the Lutheran Lent preaches Christ Crucified in a fulness and completeness which cannot be surpassed even on Christmas, Easter, or Pentecost, for all the great truths of the three highest festivals are inseparably interwoven in the sufferings of our Lord, and combine to make them what otherwise they could not be: The Passion of the Son of God, world-wide in import and eternal in result.

IV. PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

Introducing Lenten Services. Supposing a minister, realizing the profound value of the Lenten season, wishes to introduce appropriate services: How is he to go at it; how are the services to be conducted; what texts or subjects should be chosen; and what must be the specific purpose of each Lenten sermon?

Even where the people are decidedly opposed to so-called ritualism, the Lenten service quickly wins their favor when the truly Christian nature and antiquity of Lent is explained together with its living, practical Lutheran influence and aim. No legitimate objections remain. All other means failing, the minister can hold such services without further notice by preaching Christ's Passion on the six Sunday evenings before Easter. This is scarcely liturgically correct, but the divine Word takes precedence to the finest form developed by the Church, and it is a commendable beginning. Having heard six sermons, the people will gladly come one hour on Good Friday morning or evening, to hear the seventh on that vast subject. Within a few years the people are perfectly willing to attend such service on a week-day. Where a prayer meeting is customary on Wednesday, it can be easily expanded into a service, or where choir-practice is held on Friday, the members will readily grant that evening and choose another hour for practice. Either Wednesday or Friday of the six weeks was and is the favorite time among the ancient Christians as among the Lutherans. This system has certainly some

advantages over the custom of holding all the services in the one Holy Week. These seven consecutive services are apt to convey the—frequently unjustified—impression of un-Lutheran revivalism; they occupy the minister's time unduly in a week when he needs every minute to prepare himself for the arduous duties of Easter; and they crowd into an inadequately short space so comprehensive a theme as Christ's Passion, with the result that either no thorough teaching is maintained, or, where that is given, the hearers have no time to digest and assimilate the rich food. Lenten services appeal much more profitably to the congregation when distributed over six weeks. Then the minister in his Sunday sermons, in Sunday School, in the confirmation class, in the Luther League, in the homes, especially when visiting the sick and aged, can point to the weekly Lenten service, can recall certain truths and draw special lessons from them, and thus bring before his people again and again the Lamb of God taking away our sins. Making the Atonement an ever present, living fact with the people, inducing them to think of it for weeks, bringing it down into their daily life, that is one of the attractive features of the long Lutheran Lenten season. Someone has acutely observed that the vitality of a church may be tested by the popularity of its week-day services. If that is true, then let us not hesitate a moment to introduce Lenten services on week-days, and our solid Lutherans will be found not only attending but truly loving them, humming or singing the Lenten hymns at home, turning to the Bible record of the Passion, looking interestedly forward to the next service. The Cross of Christ has not lost its power.

The service itself may assume one of three characters: 1. The plain homilital; 2. the liturgical-homilital; 3. the purely liturgical, which we mention simply for the sake of completeness and therefore dispose of it in the first place.

The Purely Liturgical Service. This is a strictly Lutheran product of comparatively recent origin, and must not be confounded with the musical performances occasionally offered in some churches as a sort of attraction. The elaborate scheme has three well defined parts. First, in the opening liturgy between the minister and the whole congregation with the Introitus, the antiphones, lessons, collects, responses and chorals, the people are prepared for and led up to the prevailing theme of the service.

In the second part the main theme is unfolded in responsive singing between choir and congregation, between men and women, and children's choir, in solo, duet, etc., using prophecies, psalms, chants and recitatives in rich variety, somewhat on the order of an oratorio. Here the difficult music of the Introitus as also selections from the classics like Bach, Graun and other masters find their place. The third and concluding part consists again of liturgical responses between minister and congregation, emphasizing one great truth to be taken along into the world. The sermon is completely eliminated or a very short exhortation precedes the closing liturgy. While a service of that kind is undoubtedly edifying, it is impracticable under ordinary conditions, not only because it demands a highly efficient choir and a congregation quite at home in liturgical forms, but especially because the direct instructive preaching of the Word is missing.

There is a plainer form of liturgical service well within the capacity of the average church that fosters congregational singing. The plan is to divide the Harmony of the Passion into seven sections, one for each service. The section assigned for the evening is again divided into not less than four nor more than seven parts. After a short liturgical introduction a part of the Passion is read, followed with singing by the congregation, or by the choir, or by both, and so on until all the parts apporportioned to the evening are read. A short liturgy concludes the service. No sermon is preached. When entered into in the right spirit, these services leave a profound impression and prove that the story of Christ's Passion is overwhelming even without a single word of explanation. Yet such liturgies can never be a regular substitute for the genuine Lenten service, because they fail in the substantial breaking of the bread of life. The simpler forms are by far the more lasting and effective.

The Plain Homiletical Service. It consists of hymns, Scripture lesson, sermon, and prayer.

The hymns must invariably and directly refer to the Passion. Unfortunately, our English hymnology is as yet rather meager in true Lenten hymns. Even when counting a few private publications, the mass of Lutheran Lenten song is but partly translated and still less available for general use. Nevertheless, even if one confines himself to the Book of Worship, enough hymns

are found that are not entirely lacking in Lenten devotion, and it is not wrong to repeat one or the other hymn in the series of services.

The *Scripture lessons* must be taken from the account of the Passion; if possible, in consecutive reading from a good Harmony. Most of the German hymnbooks have a Harmony appended, which is gratefully used by the people at home and in the service. In recent years several practical works of that nature were published in the English language, and ministers once accustomed to them will not dispense with their assistance. It is not advisable to ignore the account of the Passion even when Old Testament prophecies referring to the Passion, or some apostolic sayings based on the atoning work of Christ, are selected; or, at least, it becomes then imperative to take the text for the sermon from the Passion proper, as otherwise the idea of the Lenten service suffers violence.

The *Lenten sermon* has naturally but the one object of showing the Lamb of God to a sinful world, Christ for us rather more than Christ in us. This can best be accomplished by going directly to the source, to the record of the Passion where texts, thoughts, sermons, wait in bewildering abundance. A commendable plan, which permits no important detail to go unnoticed, is the preaching on the events in their chronological order. To do this, an *exact* Harmony is much more indispensable than in the lessons. Frequently a single word, or circumstance, or scene, if read in one of the four gospels and compared with a supposed parallel passage, or if placed in the wrong position in a faulty Harmony, seems discouragingly dark, disconnected, or contradictory while, when given its legitimate place, it throws a flood of light upon the whole account. A helpful series of sermons can also be preached from the prophecies or the apostolic sayings touching the Passion; but then it is always best to adduce and explain the corresponding passage of the gospel narrative. Prophecy and fulfilment, apostolic doctrine and the underlying fact must form an inseparable union.

The *prayers* in these services ought to be short, but never failing to thank God for the accomplished Atonement, to pray for a deeper understanding of the Passion, to ask for the fruit of Christ's blood, and to utter such petitions as may be occasioned by the particular service and sermon of the evening.

Thus the plainest service, which is nothing but what the Germans call *Bibelstunde*, can be made so impressive and attractive that the people would be disappointed if the following year they were to have none.

The Liturgic-Homiletical Service. All that has been said concerning hymn, lesson, sermon, and prayer, applies also to this form of service which gains a special solemnity and charm through an appropriate liturgy. The Lutheran Church, through her innate love for all things harmonious, inspiring, and truly worshipful in her devotions, disdains every extreme also in liturgical matters, and therefore employs her treasures for the enhancement of the Lenten service. In many quarters of our Church special liturgies for the season are much favored, and they are sufficiently simple as not to make a well-trained choir an absolute necessity. These liturgies differ considerably according to individual taste or local requirement. If one declines the aid of such material, the evening service of the Book of Worship meets the want, especially if the Lenten idea is made more prominent by adding a *Kyrie* and an *Agnus Die* in some form. Nor should the Apostles' Creed be omitted, in which the second article, spoken as it were at the Cross, is of striking vividness: "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." No liturgy dare be of such length as to curtail the sermon which in Lutheran worship retains its prominent place.

V. SERMONS FOR TWENTY YEARS.

It may be asked whether there is not a danger of monotony threatening the preacher as well as hearer, if the texts are chosen each and every year from the gospel narrative of the Passion, and whether the subject is not exhausted in a few series of sermons. Such is not the case, as the writer can testify from experience, for he starts upon the nineteenth year preaching on the Passion before the same congregation, for fifteen years at least twice a week—German and English,—and discovers at every turn so much that remained to be said that, after finishing the present third course of the entire Passion, he can do nothing better than to begin immediately with the fourth.

Let here a plan be subjoined showing how the minister can preach *twenty years* on Christ's Passion, seven sermons each

year, not once repeating the same thought if he will not observe that pastoral wisdom which advises the frequent reiteration of certain truths.

Eight Years on Christ's Passion Alone. The Harmonies are of various length. Some begin with Christ's announcement of His death; if this shorter one is used, the following scheme is slightly altered in the first and second years only. Others go back to the anointing in Bethany, and with this as the basis we gain this very rich program:

I. Year: A General Survey.

1. Evening: Jesus is anointed. The errand of John and Peter.
2. Evening: The Celebration in the Upper Room.
3. Evening: Gethsemane.
4. Evening: Jesus Before the Priests.
5. Evening: Jesus Before Pilate and Herod.
6. Evening: The Crucifixion and Death.
7. Evening: The Burial.

The preacher must be very concise to cover each part in one evening and to give the hearer a clear understanding of the main scenes together with appropriate practical application. When the season is ended both he and his people will be anxious to enter into details of the wondrous story. Those seven divisions are now made the general themes for seven years, as follows:

II. Year: The Anointing. John and Peter's Errand.

1. Evening: Mary's deed. The disciples murmur.
2. Evening: Jesus defends Mary.
3. Evening: The Entry. The fear of the Pharisees.
4. Evening: Jesus announces His death.
5. Evening: The Meeting of the Council.
6. Evening: The Bargain with the Betrayer.
7. Evening: The Errand of John and Peter.

III. Year. In the Upper Room.

1. Evening: The Strife among the Disciples.
2. Evening: The Foot-Washing.
3. Evening: The New Commandment.
4. Evening: The Betrayer Excluded.
5. Evening: The Lord's Supper.
6. Evening: A Farewell Sermon.
7. Evening: Buying a Sword.

IV. Year: Going to Gethsemane, the Agony, the Arrest.

1. Evening: On the Way to the Garden.
2. Evening: In the Garden.
3. Evening: The Agony.
4. Evening: The Sleeping Disciples.
5. Evening: The Kiss of the Betrayer.
6. Evening: Peter's Sword.
7. Evening: Jesus Led Away. The Disciples Flee.

V. Year: Jesus Before the Priests.

1. Evening: Before Annas.
2. Peter's First Denial.
3. Evening: The Court of Caiaphas.
4. Evening: Two False Witnesses.
5. Evening: Oath and Death Sentence.
6. Evening: Peter's Second and Third Denial.
7. Evening: Jesus Mocked. The Morning Session.

VI. Year: Before Pilate and Herod.

1. Evening: The End of Judas.
2. Evening: Accusations. Pilate's Question.
3. Evening: Before Herod.
4. Evening: Jesus and Barabbas.
5. Evening: Jesus Scourged.
6. Evening: Behold the Man.
7. Evening: Sentenced to the Cross.

VII. Year: On Calvary.

1. Evening: Simon of Cyrene.
2. Evening: The Wailing Women.
3. Evening: The Superscription.
4. Evening: The Parted Garments.
5. Evening: Mockeries all Around.
6. Evening: Friends Near the Cross.
7. Evening: Noonday Darkness and Death.

VIII. Year: The Burial.

1. Evening: Signs at His Death.
2. Evening: The Centurion.
3. Evening: The Mourners.
4. Evening: The Breaking of Bones.
5. Evening: Joseph and Nicodemus.
6. Evening: The Funeral Procession.
7. Evening: The Seal and the Watch.

Even a hasty perusal, and infinitely more an exact study of the text, reveals the fact that the smallest portion assigned to one service furnishes so much to discuss, to explain, and to apply, that it is almost impossible to use it all in one sermon. At every step we are led into the depths of the Bible, into divers conditions of human life, into the recesses of man's heart, into the mysteries of eternity. There is nothing more sensational, more fascinating, more practical, than a study of Christ's Passion.

Now here we have a program for eight years. In eight years children have grown to be young men and women, other children taking their places. The young people of eight years ago have now perhaps established their own home. The minister himself has grown in this time, his experience is wider, his knowledge profounder, his judgment keener, and he looks with clearer eye into his Bible and into the hearts of men. If he now looks at the old manuscript of his first Lenten sermon, he smiles sadly if he ever had the conceit to believe that eight years ago he spoke out all the truth, the most interesting, the most needful truth slumbering in his text! With new hearers and new needs about him and with new conceptions in heart and mind, why should he not go through the whole series once more? The chances are that, apart from such considerations, in these eight years the dear old, noble account of the Passion has so thoroughly warmed and won his heart that he could not turn from it next Lent, even if he tried.

Yet if the unexpected happens and for any reason whatever a different style of Lenten sermons is desired, does that necessarily imply a setting aside of the Passion? By no means. Unusual possibilities offer themselves in the simultaneous treatment of prophecies and their fulfilment in Christ's Passion.

Six Years on Prophecy and its Fulfilment in Christ's Passion. There is no reason why not eight or nine years should be provided with such sermons, the Old Testament opens a wide field. Certainly, no sermon on the Passion can be preached without reference to the prophets; but it is an entirely different task to study the prophecies in detail, to follow their fate through the intervening centuries, and to meet them fulfilled in the details of the Passion. The sinful paths of a wayward nation are distinctly traced, leading to the inevitable point of rejecting Christ; the hand of God is plainly seen controlling and directing the

affairs of men until they center and are sanctified, regenerated, or simply utilized in the Cross of Calvary. A spirit of accentuated awe attaches to such sermons. It will be noticed that our plan of six years is merely a suggestion and can be readily improved, modified, restricted or expanded in texts or subjects.

FIRST YEAR.

*Prophecy:**Fulfillment:*

1. Love and its Blessings.....Mary Anointing Jesus
Song of Sol. 1, 2-4. Gen. 12,2-3.
Lev. 16, 12-13. I Chron. 17, 27.
2. I delight to do Thy will.....Jesus announces His Death.
Ps. 40, 6-8.
3. Going to the Sanctuary.....Jesus enters Jerusalem, etc.
Ezek. 44, 27. II. Sam. 7, 12-13. Ps. 24, 7-10.
4. Whispering together.....The meeting of the Rulers.
Ps. 41, 7-8.
5. The false friend.....The bargain with Judas.
Ps. 41, 9; 55, 12-14.
6. Institution of the Passover.....In the Upper Room.
Exod. 12.
7. The Old Covenant.....The New Commandment.
Exod. 3:20. II Kings 23, 21-22.
II. Chron. 35, 1-19; Jerem. 31, 31-34.

SECOND YEAR.

1. The Blood of Beasts.....The Lord's Supper.
Exod. 24, 6-8; 29, 10-12; 36; 30, 10.
2. The Scattered Sheep....."All Ye Shall be Offended."
Zech. 13, 7.
3. Hours of Grief.....The Agony.
Ps. 91, 11-15; Isai. 54, 7-14; 63, 8-9.
4. They Gather Themselves Together..Jesus Taken Captive.
Ps. 35, 7; 15-16.
5. Unfaithful Priests.....Before Annas and Caiaphas.
I. Sam. 2, 10, 35.
6. Visions of the Future.....The Son of Man in the
Dan. 7, 13-14; Deut. 18, 18-19. Clouds of Heaven
Deut. 32, 41-43.

7. Help for the Needy.....Peter's Repentance.
Ps. 72, 12-14.

THIRD YEAR.

1. False Witnesses.....False Witnesses.
Ps. 27, 12; 35, 11-12; 19.
2. The Bloody Sacrifice.....Sentenced by the Priests.
Numb. 19, 2-4; Ps. 118, 22-23.
3. Potters' Field.....The End of Judas.
Zech. 11, 12-13.
4. Be wise, Ye Judges.....Before Pilate.
Ps. 2, 10; 24, 10; 52, 7; 112, 4-7.
5. Without a Blemish.....Testimonials of Innocence.
Lev. 21, 21-23; Jerem. 23, 6.
6. The Kings rise up.....Before Herod.
Ps. 2, 2.
7. His Stripes.....Jesus Scourged.
Isai. 50, 6; 52, 13-15; 53, 5-6.

FOURTH YEAR.

1. The King.....The Crown of Thorns, Behold Your King.
Ps. 72.
2. The Sign of Blood.....His Blood Be Upon Us.
Exod. 12, 13.
3. A Man of Sorrows.....Behold the Man.
Isai. 53, 3-4.
4. Our Iniquities.....He Bore His Cross.
Isai. 53, 4-7.
5. Among Transgressors.....Two Malefactors Led Forth.
Isai. 53, 12; Lev. 4, 20-21.
6. The Day of Terror.....The Wailing Women.
Isai. 2, 19-21; 13, 6-14.
7. Sin and Atonement.....The Crucifixion.
Gen. 3, 15; Lev. 16, 29-34;
Deut. 12, 13-14; Ps. 89, 45.

FIFTH YEAR.

1. Giving Good for Evil.....Father, Forgive Them.
Ps. 109, 2-5; 110, 4; Isai. 53, 12.

2. Casting Lots.....The Parted Garments.
Ps. 22, 13-18.
3. The Lasting Name.....The Superscription.
Ps. 72, 17-19.
4. Aha, aha.....Mockeries on Calvary.
Ps. 22, 6-8; 35, 21; 69, 21.
5. Believe, and Be Saved.....*The Repentant Thief*.
Numb. 21, 8-9; Isai. 9, 2; 42, 1-7.
6. Threatening Darkness.....Darkness About the Cross.
Ps. 97, 2; Amos 8, 9.
7. A Sad Complaint.....Why Hast Thou Forsaken Me?
Ps. 22, 1-2.

SIXTH YEAR.

1. Giving Up the Spirit.....Into Thine hands, etc.
Ps. 31, 5; Isai. 62, 4.
2. The Shaking Earth.....The Death of Jesus.
Ps. 18, 4-7; 50, 3-6.
3. The Profaned Sanctuary.....The Veil Rent in Twain.
Isai. 26, 19; 43, 22-28; Nahum 1, 5-6.
4. The Righteous One.....The Centurion's Confession.
Is. 22, 30-31; 98, 2-3; 102, 15; Isai. 60, 3.
5. Mourning for Him.....The Multitudes on Calvary.
Zech. 12, 10.
6. No Bones Shall be Broken.....The Wounded Side.
Numb. 9, 12; Ps. 34, 20.
7. Buried with the Rich.....Joseph's Garden.
53, 9.

Such sermons are bound to make the dim past a living, realistic, practical, instructive preparation for Christ's Passion, granting new views of the Old Testament, and throwing a remarkable light upon the events of Holy Week. The minister who has found those studies profitable, will not forget that the Passion also looks forward and a promising field invites to a series of sermons on the apostolic doctrines related to the Passion in connection with underlying facts. We limit ourselves to a course of three years which again may be altered and extended in many ways.

Three Years on Apostolic Doctrine and the History of the Passion. The word *history* refers first of all to the gospel narrative which must receive fullest attention, but it means also the active influence of the Passion upon the apostolic congregations and down to the third century. How those noble men and women, from the highest dignitary in church and community down to the poorest slave, gladly endured all hardships because their Savior had suffered the same things! With them each detail of the Passion was an ever present reality shaping their conduct and worship. This brings a heroic element into the Passion of Christ and that of his servants after him, almost overwhelming in effect; it touches every phase of life and becomes a powerful appeal to our weakly age.

FIRST YEAR.

*Doctrine:**History:*

1. Christ loved us.....Scenes in the Guest Chamber.
Ephes. 5, 2.
2. The new Covenant.....The Lord's Supper.
Heb. 12, 24.
3. The Prophet.....Farewell Sermons.
Acts 3, 22-24.
4. His Obedience.....Not My Will Be Done.
Phil. 2, 8.
5. He Gave Himself.....The Arrest.
Gal. 1, 4.
6. Christ Must Suffer.....Peter's Sword.
Acts 26, 22-23.
7. The Rulers Condemn Him..Before Annas and Caiaphas.
Acts 13, 27-29.

SECOND YEAR.

1. The Kings of the Earth.....Before Pilate and Herod.
Acts 4, 26-28.
2. He reviled not again.....The Silent Jesus.
I. Pet. 2, 22-23.
3. Denying the Holy One.....Barabbas.
Acts 3, 13-15.

4. The Jews Killed Jesus.....Crucify Him!
I. Thess. 2, 14-15.
5. Without the Gate.....On the Way to Calvary.
Heb. 13, 12-13.
6. He Bore Our Sins.....Jesus Bore His Cross.
I. Pet. 2, 24-25.
7. A Ransom for All.....Jesus the Crucified.
I. Tim. 2, 5-6.

THIRD YEAR.

1. The Stumbling Block.....Himself He Cannot Help.
I. Cor. 1, 23-24.
2. Looking Unto Jesus.....John and Mary at the Cross.
Heb. 12, 2-4.
3. Peace Through His Blood.....It is Finished
Col. 1, 20-22.
4. Made a Curse.....Taking the Body Away.
Gal. 3, 13; Col. 2, 14.
5. The Cleansing Blood.....The Open Side.
Rom. 3, 23-25; I. John 1, 7.
6. He was Buried.....The Burial.
I. Cor. 15, 3-4; Acts 2, 26-27.
7. Worthy the Lamb.....Meditations at the Tomb.
Rev. 5, 11-14.

If now a minister has preached on the Passion in every Lent for seventeen years or more, has he exhausted it and is he compelled to seek other sources for live subjects? No, he is not yet done with the noble account of the gospels. In the preaching of the previous years certain important details were necessarily given no more than a passing notice, and holding them separately up to the height new beauties and lessons are met. The following three years' plan is the merest hint as to the possibilities of solid, forceful preaching through many years.

Three Years on Important Details of the Passion. In the first eight years the Suffering Savior was most prominent; in the succeeding six years he stood forth against the mysterious background of God's providence and government; in the next three years he showed his power over his followers; in this last series He turns His searching eye directly upon the individual sinner.

While no Lenten sermon is without it, yet here is the one unsurpassed opportunity of studying the heart, mind, and conscience of man in the surrounding conditions of daily life.

First Year: Take the seven principal actors in the Passion, one for each service: John, Peter, Judas, Annas, Caiaphas, Herod and Pilate. Give a sort of biographical sketch, but in each instance ask and answer the following questions: What part did he take in the Passion and what were his motives? How did he increase or ameliorate the sorrows of the Lord? What did he gain and what did he lose by his conduct? Which of our trials and temptations, of our sins or virtues are equal or similar to his?

Second Year: There are a number of people standing modestly aside, yet each with a mighty sermon for the seven services. The Mother Mary: Women and the Cross. Magdalene: What the cross means to converted souls. Salome: Giving home and family to the Crucified, does it pay? Barabbas: What the Passion did for Criminals—man's *passions*, Christ's Passion, Divine Compassion. Centurion: The Passion moves rough men, even Gentiles. Nicodemus: The Passion calls timid believers to the front. Joseph: The Passion opens heart and hand.

Third Year: Making the office, nature, and state of Christ the central idea, special conditions receive their due, as in the following seven themes: The Prophet: His doctrine, piety, and life tested in the Passion. The Priest: His sacrifice affecting himself, his church, false religion, history, etc. The King: All disgrace intended for him turned into glory by him. The Messiah of Israel: The sins of a nation set forth in his last works and sermons and moments. The Son of God: It is astonishing how many things in the Passion seem to contradict his Godhead, and still more marvellous how those same things proclaim his Godhead right then and there. The Son of Man: How he excels the greatest among men in all human perfections just when he was the least among men. The Savior: How the fate of a whole world depended in so many respects on those six hours on Calvary.

VI. CONCLUSION.

Apart from the principal object of the Lenten sermon, which consists in preaching the Savior of sinners to a lost world, many

other valuable results come from such services, of which we mention a few. For instance, a better knowledge of the Bible is imparted. The Passion is that ocean of divine love into which enter the rivers of truth from the Old Testament, and from which issue the streams of life flowing through the epistles of the New Testament. The Passion cannot be preached without giving a wide acquaintance with the Word of God to the congregation. Again, the suffering, dying Christ has always exerted an extraordinary power upon believers and unbelievers alike. Where can one find more effective means to call the erring ones, to strengthen the weak, and to establish the faithful, than by bringing them into full view of the Cross? And another fruit: In our time when so much human righteousness, character-building, true manhood and perfect womanhood are preached while the doctrine of sin and divine pardon is neglected; when Jesus is held up as a pattern but not as a Savior; when at the best the Christ *In Us* is preached, and seldom the Christ *For Us*; it is the mission and the power of the Passion to convince the sinner of the need, of the verity, and of the blessedness of Christ's Atonement. Therefore the loyal Lutheran greets with joy the increasing interest evinced in one of the most precious possessions of his Church: The Lenten service.

Greenville, Ohio.

ARTICLE VIII.

CHARGE TO PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.*

BY JACOB HENRY CULLER, D.D.

President of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College.

The Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College is to have a permanent addition to its corps of capable and efficient instructors. You, my dear brother, have been elected by the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College to serve in the position designated as the Chair of Symbolics. The Advent Season seems a fitting time for this significant service. We are now assembled to formally induct you into your office. You have been chosen with great unanimity and special heartiness. It is gratifying that it is so. So far as we have been able to learn your election has given satisfaction throughout the Church. You have come to the place God meant for you—the glorious company of the Apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of Martyrs, our fathers of a like precious faith—we long to join hands with them all, and catch the contagion of their heroic confidence. For is it not written in the vital organism of Wittenberg College that it shall not only promote higher Christian education, but that in the prosecution of this work, *“a chief aim shall be the education of young men for the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church?”* In thinking of how wisely and well the foundations are laid, and how this precious heritage has come to us it is well to remember that, “we begin, with the momentum of other disciplined lives behind us, debtors to a ministering ancestry, and in them to a ministering God.” You have not come into an easy place, a position for life, simply, but into a high place of great and increasing opportunity and, to the sincere soul, of solemn responsibility. We congratulate you. Your specific work is to train ministers of the Word for our Church and time, and send them out equipped to bear a living message

* Delivered upon the inauguration of Prof. Neve, as Professor of Symbolics, in the Hamma Divinity School, December 8th, 1910.

to living men—able to command attention and to move men to accept the truth and yield to its high and holy behests. What a privilege is this! How ever widening, unceasing, unlimited is the reach of this your work! Yes, your greatest work may be helping one or more young men in preparation to do a greater work. We cease to wonder that you and your co-laborers in this school of the prophets are here and ready for any reasonable sacrifice when we remember the spiritual attractions of your call and work. You may be sure we too are glad that we discovered you. It is to our advantage that you were born and trained a German. After a residence of more than a score of years in this your adopted land, six of which were spent as a regular pastor and seventeen as a teacher of theology, you are able to rightly analyze existing conditions in our own beloved Church, and in our relation to other Churches. You are not a novice as an instructor in sacred things. We believe you to be a sincere Christian man in whose daily walk and conversation will be exemplified your teaching. The main thing in education is the sympathetic, inspiring contact of the taught with the live, enthusiastic, consecrated teacher. A man of this kind is a legion in himself. There is a power in the devout conscientious life that goes out silently creating a spiritual atmosphere in its presence and its work. You have given proof of your aptness to teach, not only to think but to set those under your care to think. "A truth that costs no thought, wields no power. Religion has more to fear from unthinking acceptance than from hostile criticism. When faith is too familiar to be thoughtful, it lives by help of the accidents, rather than through possessions of the essentials of truth." In the class-room and intercourse with the students the alert teacher will not overlook the necessity to develop and discipline the mental and spiritual powers of his pupils. Competent use of their knowledge is an end sought in the training you give your students. What they get through your instruction, is that, as ministers of the Word they may be "workmen that need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." We have reason to rejoice in your special fitness for the chair of Symbolics. This subject has always received attention in the course of instruction in our Seminary, but in this day of specialization and because of the ever increasing interest and the importance of this branch of theology in our Church this chair has

been provided. Your experience as editor of a church paper, for several years, your familiarity with the German language and the rich treasures it holds for the student of theology, together with a natural bent of mind and heart and your scholarly equipment and the opportunities and advantages you have had and used, all combine, under the dominion of grace, to eminently qualify you to live and teach in this place to which you have been called. We believe you to be a man of decided convictions with courage to make them known, but with your natural reserve and kindly way to conciliate rather than antagonize in seeking after the truth. It is well to remember that we are Lutherans. That "in our Church Confessions and our forms of Church worship, in which is embodied every possible principle of Christian faith and life we have the grandest heritage of any of God's children on earth." We think you have a keen sense of appreciation of what we possess and that your life and work here will always be characterized by a spirit of loyalty to our Lutheran faith, and fidelity to our Lutheran practice, maintaining the dignity of the Church and the nobility of the Gospel. The young men who go out from this institution are to be fortified against the opposition they are sure to encounter in the everyday active work of the ministry. Your familiarity with the history of Christian doctrine, the formation of doctrinal statements and the cause and construction of symbols of faith and your desire not to fight shy of any difficulty or heresy will be felt by your pupils and communicated in your instruction. The history of old and present day errors, by whatever name or in whatever form they are presented, teaches us, as one of your colleagues has well put it, "to hold on to our faith in the old doctrine of an inspired Bible, in the old ideas of the fall and redemption, the old warnings of judgment and condemnation, the old necessity for faith and regeneration and the wisdom of God as superior to reason as a source of authority in the greatest concerns of life."

And now I conclude, persuaded that we are to soon have in your inaugural address a clear and satisfactory presentation of the subject you have chosen and that there has been no mistake in calling you to this important position in the service of the Church for the extension and upbuilding of the kingdom of our

Lord and Savior in the hearts and lives of the children of men.

"God bless your going out, nor less
Your coming in, and make them sure:
God bless your daily bread, and bless
What'er you do—what'er endure.
In death unto His presence awake you,
And heir to His salvation make you."

Wapakoneta, O.

THE FORMULATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD'S CONFESSIONAL BASIS.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

As a subject on which to speak on the occasion of my inauguration to the chair of Symbolics in Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, I have chosen a confessional problem which is before the General Synod now. At the last convention held in Richmond, Ind., after the very remarkable "Statements Relative to the General Synod's Doctrinal Basis" prepared by Dr. L. S. Keyser, had been adopted, the following resolution offered by Dr. J. A. Clutz, was passed:¹

"Resolved, That the Common Service Committee be and hereby is instructed to codify the several resolutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod, adopted at York, Pa., in 1864; at Hagerstown, Md., in 1895; at Des Moines, Ia., in 1901, and at the present session of the General Synod, and incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis, and to report the same at the next meeting of the General Synod with a view to placing it in the Constitution of the General Synod by amendment in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, there being no intention in this action in any way to change our present Doctrinal Basis."

¹ See Proceedings of the Forty-fourth Convention of the General Synod, in session at Richmond, Ind., June 2-10, 1909. Page 115.

Though not a member of the Common Service Committee I feel sure that it will not be found out of place for me or any other member of the General Synod to present a discussion on this important subject; as I feel also sure that the committee mentioned will welcome any suggestions as to the solution of the problem. For that this task is no easy one will be admitted by every one familiar with the confessional history of our General Synod and the discussions that we have had on that subject in even recent times.

"There being no intention in this action in any way to change our present Doctrinal Basis"—this closing phrase was, at the suggestion of Dr. Keyser, added to the resolution as read by Dr. Clutz. This had reference, as I understand, especially to the thought that outside of the Augsburg Confession none of the other confessional writings shall be included as obligatory in that "one clear and definite statement" which, from the time of its adoption, shall constitute the "Doctrinal Basis" of our General Synod and take the place of the formula heretofore used. On that subject the Richmond Resolutions stated: "As to the Secondary Confessions of the Lutheran Church, the General Synod in no wise ignores, rejects, repudiates or antagonizes them, nor forbids any of her members from accepting all of them, if they so desire. On the other hand, she holds those confessions in high esteem, regards them as a most valuable body of Lutheran belief, explaining and unfolding the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and she hereby recommends that they be diligently studied by our ministers and laymen."² Anybody reading these words feels that it would detract from the dignity of the form of confessional subscription, which is to be used at solemn services of the church, at the ordination of ministers, the installation of professors, etc., if we should incorporate any of these words in that formula. They may have their place among the "Explanatory Statements" such as ordered by the last General Synod,³ but in the nature of the case can not go into that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis." So you see there can be no temptation whatever to change the present Doctrinal Basis by including any statement concerning the Secondary Confessions in the form of subscription. For the reason mentioned

² Minutes, p. 57.

³ See Minn., pp. 59, 60.

even these Richmond statements can not be incorporated in the form of subscription. If there are any among us who are suspicious in this respect, they can dismiss all fear.

To include more than the Augustana as confessionally binding would also be contrary to what the Hagerstown Resolution stated regarding the Augsburg Confession when it said: "Nothing more, nothing less." Only in passing I want to say for the ears of our critics that this is a position that can well be maintained by a Lutheran body. The great majority of Lutheran churches and synods in Europe and America who do not and would not accept more than the Augustana as obligatory, accept without formal subscription to the other symbols the confessionally essential elements in these great historical writings. So does the General Synod to-day. *She cannot do otherwise when accepting the Augsburg Confession ex animo.* What we simply have in mind in limiting our confessional subscription to the Augustana is this: We want to express the thought that a church is justified in distinguishing between the essential and universally acknowledged doctrines of the Lutheran Reformation as they came to an expression in those memorable times when this great religious movement first came to be acknowledged as a church, on the one hand, and, on the other, the elaboration of these doctrines in the form of theological reflection and speculative exhibition. Whatever of these expositions must be regarded, "in the light of the Lutheran regulating principle of justifying faith," as *necessary interpretation of those doctrines*, are, of course, inseparable from the teachings of the Augustana. But they can not claim to be a creed in the same manner as is the Augsburg Confession.⁴ That phrase of the Hagerstown Resolution has sometimes been criticized, and it sounds plausible when, for instance, Dr. Jacobs says: "When truth unchallenged at Augsburg are

4. Compare Kahnis, "Christentum und Luthertum" on page 130 concerning the Form of Concord. And p. 136, for instance, he has this to say even of Luther's Small Catechism: "In evangelical truth and consecration as well as in popular simplicity, clearness and power, it surpasses anything that has ever been written in this respect. None of our Confessions have been so written in the spirit of God as must be said of the Small Catechism. And next to the Scriptures no other book has so impressed the hearts of men." And then Kahnis goes on to say: "But as symbolical writings both Catechisms can not claim the authority of the Augsburg Confession." He gives two reasons: 1. because they were not direct testimonies of the Church; 2. according to their purpose they did not give complete expression to the doctrinal character of Lutheranism.

misunderstood and misrepresented, we are not faithful witnesses if we be silent upon the plea that 'we hold to the Augsburg Confession—nothing more, nothing less.'⁵ Certainly we admit that it is the duty of the Church to testify whenever error comes up, and we think that the Form of Concord was the most necessary testimony, but this does not include that such new statement of truth must now, like the Augsburg Confession, become the object of confessional subscription. Some time after the promulgation of the Form of Concord there was a controversy in the Lutheran Church as to how Christ exercised His divine attributes in the state of His humiliation, which was settled by the so-called *Decisio Saxonica*. But while this document contained a very happy statement of the truth, we do not make it an object of confessional subscription. So we in the General Synod say: The Augsburg Confession, nothing more, nothing less. And when we say: "Nothing more" we do not mean by that to exclude what in the *Smalcald Articles* and in the *Form of Concord* is a proper interpretation and a legitimate development of the doctrines of the *Augustana*. We simply do not bind our ministers to these Secondary Confessions in their entirety and especially not to the form in which they state the truth.⁶

Not every age can produce a creed. If it is not a gradual, unconscious growth as in the case of the Apostle's Creed then there must be that inspiration called forth by a great historical occasion, that immense burden of responsibility, that tension and that harmony between many of like faith, which all combined to enable our confessors at Augsburg and particularly Melancthon, to make those brief lapidary statements of fundamental importance for the doctrinal life of our Church. Prof. Seeberg calls attention to the fact that at the time when the Form of Concord was composed, "the productive period of the Reformation age which alone possessed the ability to give us a creed was about to pass,"⁷ and Prof. Kolde feels that it is necessary to admit that

5 *The Lutheran*, March 5th, 1908, p. 403.

6 Luthardt speaks of the truths of the Form of Concord as presented "im theologischen Gewande jener Zeit," "in einer scholastischen Gestalt, die uns jetzt fremdartig erscheint, da wir nicht mehr nach so formalistischer Logik, wie es damals Brauch war, zu denken gewohnt sind, sondern mehr geschichtlich und lebendig zu denken pflegen." Die "*Christl Glaubenslehre gemeinverständlich dargestellt*," page 361.

7 *Realencyclopaedies X*, p. 734.

the Form of Concord lacks the pulse beats of a real confession.* All this contains our justification for distinguishing between the Augustana and the Secondary Confessions *when it comes to credal subscription*. The General Synod declared at Richmond: "The Augsburg Confession is the original and generic Lutheran Confession, accepted by Luther and his coadjutors, adopted by all Lutheran bodies the world over, and is therefore generally recognized as the adequate and sufficient standard of Lutheran doctrine."⁹

But back again to the theme of our discourse. We wanted to discuss the question: What elements should be embodied in that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis?" We will agree on this, that there can be no phrase regarding the Secondary Confessions. All that was said in Richmond concerning them was valuable, inasmuch as it was sufficient to put the General Synod's stamp of disapproval upon utterances many of which we have had in our past history, intended to bring contempt on these most important documents; and valuable also as a testimony over against others who misunderstand our attitude toward the Form of Concord. But since we are not ready to say more and do not wish to make the Secondary Confessions binding, we can incorporate no statement concerning them into our formula.

We proceed to another point regarding the formulation of our Doctrinal Basis. I feel sure that we as a General Synod in mentioning the Augsburg Confession as the symbol on which we place ourselves will be ready to insert the word "unaltered," as employed in the Hagerstown Resolution. Not that we meant anything else in our old formula. But in the confessional history of the Lutheran Church that qualification "unaltered" has come to stand for a conservative theology that means to maintain the genuine Lutheran principles in a number of questions of vital importance. It has special reference to Article X, and also to Articles XVIII and XX, in connection with IV and VI.¹⁰ It can be admitted that there are changes from the original also in the "Invariata," which we can tell by comparing the Latin

8 Historische Einleitung zu Mueller's Symb. Buechern, LXXIII.

9 Min. of 1909, p. 57.

10 Comp. Zoekler, Die Augsburgische Konfession, pp. 37-39. Schaaf, *Credo of Christendom*, Vol. I, 240.

Editio princeps with such an exhibition of the harmony of the most reliable manuscripts (preserved in the different archives of Germany) as has been presented us by Prof. Tschackert of Goettingen.¹¹ But these changes are of no doctrinal importance.¹² Our qualifying the Augustana as "unaltered" simply means a disavowal of the "Variata" of 1540 (and its successors) with its most significant alterations; and not so much at present of the document itself which few know¹³ and no Lutheran body to-day adopts formally, but of the Melancthonian theology back of this document,¹⁴ a theology which labored to bridge over the difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism, and which, in its representatives of a later age, has paved the way for a movement that aims to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches by treating their doctrinal distinctions, especially regarding the Lord's Supper, as a matter of indifference. The old and much ventilated question of "Variata" and "Invariata" can not here be discussed with the comprehensiveness that it calls for when considered in its bearing on inner-Protestant developments. I have prepared a discourse on this subject which I am to read before the Luther Club of this city, and which may find its way into print. But I am sure that without much additional study of the subject the General Synod will be ready to name the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession in that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis."

It may not be quite as easy for us to agree as to what shall be done with the phrase "fundamental doctrines." In our present confessional paragraph we say: "And the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the *fundamental doctrines* of the divine

11 Die unveraenderte Augsburgische Konfession, deutsch und lateinisch, von P. Tschackert.

12 The men who are so eager to demonstrate that there is no sense in talking of an "unaltered" Augsburg Confession as over against an "altered" edition hope to win their case by writing of the two original copies (Latin and German) which are lost and then telling us of all the "altered" editions (Variatae) beginning with Melancthon's first edition of 1530-31 (the Editio princeps, our so-called "Invariata" from which the English translation in our Book of Worship is prepared) up to those of 1540 and 1542 and later. So did already Dr. G. G. Weber in his otherwise excellent work: "Kritische Geschichte der Augsburgischen Konfession." But in this way they confuse the question from the beginning.

13 Printed in English translation in Dr. Jacobs' Book of Concord; also Latin in Kolde, Die Augsburgische Konfession mit Beilagen; also in Corp. Reform. Vol. XXVI., pp. 349 sqq.

14 Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I, p. 240.

Word." This was qualified by the Des Moines Resolution of 1901 in the following manner: "And we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription."¹⁵ This same resolution was reiterated at the Richmond convention of our General Synod with great emphasis. It was there said: "She (the General Synod) does not mean that some of the doctrines set forth in the Confession are non-fundamental, and, therefore, may be accepted or rejected; she means that they all are fundamental, and their exhibition in the Confession is to be accepted by those who subscribe to the Confession."¹⁶ And over against those who hold that the confessional resolutions of Hagerstown and Des Moines "do not have the force of confessional amendments, having never been formally adopted by two-thirds of the Synods, according to the constitutional requirement (Art. VI, Sec. 2), and therefore are not a part of the doctrinal basis," the General Synod at Richmond declared "that the section above cited refers only to *alterations* of the General Synod's constitution; but the confessional resolutions referred to are not alterations of the constitution, and contemplate no alterations; they are simply explanations of the meaning of the General Synod's confessional basis. Therefore it is not necessary to submit them to the District Synods of the General Synod. Inasmuch then as they were passed by the General Synod in regular session and have never been revoked by this body, they therefore become and remain a part of the confessional assets of the General Synod."¹⁷ And then the resolution was passed by which, among other declarations, it was provided that this Des Moines Resolution also shall "with headings prefixed, be printed in all future editions of the Augsburg Confession published by the General Synod, whether issued in separate form or in our Books of Worship and that they be inserted immediately after the York Resolution." (p. 59). This is certainly in unmistakable language a declaration of how the phrase "fundamental doctrines" is not to be interpreted as well as how it must be understood. And now there is the instruction given at Richmond to codify the several reso-

¹⁵ See Minutes, 1901, p. 83.

¹⁶ Minutes of 1909, p. 57.

¹⁷ Min. p. 85.

lutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod.....and to "incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement." The history of our confessional development demands a recognition of this declaration in the Des Moines Resolution. But how shall it be done? By retaining the phrase "fundamental doctrines" and defining it according to the Des Moines interpretation, or by omitting it altogether?

In starting out to discuss this matter let me say: We in the General Synod do not any more understand the words "fundamental doctrines" as our fathers did. They meant, by employing this phrase, to limit the obligation to those parts of the Augsburg Confession which treat of such doctrines of God's Word as are of fundamental character. That there could be no thought of accepting the whole Augustana, every doctrine in it, as confessionally binding, was to them a matter on which there ought to be no dispute. So convinced they were that even concerning the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God they did not risk to state more than that they were taught in the Augsburg Confession "in a manner substantially correct." This very objectionable phrase was, it is true, removed at the meeting of the General Synod in Harrisburg (1868), but in the words substituted the phrase "fundamental doctrines" was retained. How this phrase was understood we can learn from contemporaneous writing on the confessional question. Permit me to adduce a few testimonies.

Dr. S. S. Schmucker was the man who put the words "fundamental doctrines" into all the earlier documents of the General Synod. These words were so important to him that he had them underscored with pen and ink in the books which he used, and he printed them in italics in his publications. His writings abound with assertions that the General Synod employed this phrase in order to indicate that the confessional obligation of her members should be restricted to the *fundamental* doctrines of the Scriptures only; and in connection with such statements he excepted whole articles of the Augustana and parts of some as not containing fundamental doctrines of God's Word. The Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper he regarded as not fundamental, and Art. X was therefore not confessionally binding.

The Rev. Dr. Harkey preached, in 1859, an official sermon be-

fore the General Synod, which afterwards was published by a unanimous vote of this body. In that sermon the following words occur: "How has the General Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession? How could she adopt it with the hope of uniting the Lutherans in America, and not burden the consciences of any good men among us? I reply, there was only one way possible, and as a matter of course she must take that plan. She adopted it as to *fundamentals*, and to these she requires unqualified subscription. Objections have been urged against the expression 'fundamental doctrines' as meaning one thing in the mouth of one man, and a different thing in the mouth of another; that to some everything is fundamental, and to others only a few points. Now I can not reply to this at length, at present, but have only to say in a few words, *that there are fundamental doctrines* in Christianity, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy knows what they are."¹⁸ We certainly agree with Dr. Harkey that there are fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in Christianity, but what interests us here is his declaration, endorsed by the General Synod that "she adopted it (the Augustana) as to fundamentals." And we need to remember that when the General Synod voted to publish this sermon she had among its members men like Drs. Mann, Krauth and Schaef-fer, afterwards professors in the General Council's seminary in Philadelphia. It shows that at that time it was a conviction common to all that in the adoption of the Augustana there should be a distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals.

And let me quote Charles Porterfield Krauth at a time when he was yet a member of the General Synod. In 1864 he wrote: "She (the General Synod) satisfied herself, therefore, with an affirmative about fundamentals, making neither an affirmation nor a denial in regard to non-fundamentals. She left the synods in absolute freedom in non-fundamentals, freedom to doubt, to reject and to *receive* them." And to make sure that Dr. Krauth did not mean simply non-fundamental and non-essential "features," such as errors in quotation and other unimportant matters,¹⁹ but non-fundamental *doctrines*, I quote from the same article: "Brethren may differ as to whether the non-fun-

¹⁸ Lutheran Quarterly 1895, p. 477.

¹⁹ Comp. Prof. Kawerau's letter in the Holman Lecture in July number of LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 1909, p. 330.

damental doctrines, as well as the fundamental doctrines, are correctly stated in the Confession. Let them differ. We make no decision whatever as to that point. Both agree as to *fundamentals*. Therefore fundamentals only shall be the object of this subscription. We affirm of them that they are taught correctly in the Confession. Of the non-fundamentals we affirm nothing, and deny nothing. Neither their reception nor their rejection has anything to do with this basis."²⁰ The only article which Dr. Krauth excepted among the first twenty-one, from confessional obligation was Article XI on Confession. He says: "They are, in their main tenor fundamental to Evangelical Protestantism, and to the Reformation itself, with the exception of Article XI which is neither fundamental to Protestantism nor to Lutheranism."²¹

I want it understood that I am not offering these quotations to prove that there shall be confessional obligation to only part of the Augustana. What I want to show is simply how the leading men of the General Synod, in a former time, interpreted the phrase "fundamental doctrines." Dr. Krauth modified his conception soon after the publication of these articles.

Let me quote one witness more, a man of influence in the General Synod, the acknowledged leader in the critical time after the separation of 1866, I mean Dr. J. A. Brown, Professor of Theology at Gettysburg. He also discriminated between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of the Augustana. In the Allentown Church Case, in 1875, he testified as follows, in answer to the question: "What are the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession?"

"A full and definite answer to this question is hardly possible, or even practicable, as the Confession embraces twenty-eight distinct articles, . . . but the central doctrine is that of justification by faith alone in Jesus Christ, and all doctrines centering around this one are regarded as fundamental. I answer that I consider that the First Article contains a fundamental doctrine on the Godhead; the Second Article is fundamental on Sin; the Third Article is fundamental on the person and work of the Son of God; the Fourth Article is fundamental; Fifth Article, on the Ministry, containing a fundamental doctrine; Sixth Article, on

20 *Lutheran and Missionary*, March 31, 1864.

21 *Lutheran and Missionary*, April 21.

New Obedience, fundamental; Seventh Article, of the Church, containing fundamental doctrines; Eleventh Article of Confession, not fundamental so far as confession and private absolution are concerned; Article Twelfth, of Repentance, contains a fundamental doctrine; Article Thirteenth, of the Use of the Sacraments, contains a fundamental doctrine; Article Fourteenth, of Church Government, fundamental as far as good order in the church is concerned; Article Fifteenth, of Church Rites and Ordinances, contains Fundamental truths; Article Sixteenth, of Civil Polity and Government, contains things fundamental and non-fundamental; Article Seventeenth, fundamental; Article Eighteenth contains fundamental doctrines; Article Nineteenth may be called fundamental; Articles Twenty and Twenty-first contain fundamental doctrines."

So then Dr. Brown counted among the first twenty-one articles only seven as fundamental, one as non-fundamental, one as partly fundamental and partly non-fundamental, and all the others such as contain doctrines of fundamental character.

Dr. Brown was a conservative, reliable theologian, and his theory would not have been so very objectionable if it had not been given in connection with the confessional formula of the General Synod: "the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." But thus great parts of the Augustana were not included in the confessional subscription. And as other men might hold a much less conservative theory as to what parts of the Augustana are fundamental and what not, our confessional formula as we have it since 1869²² would be an obligation that is no obligation. During the confessional controversies in connection with adopting the Common Service, Catechism and Ministerial Acts there were all kinds of radical expressions as to statements in the Augustana that did not come within the scope of the General Synod's confessional subscription. Emphasis was always laid on the words: "*fundamental* doctrines;" it was said that such doctrines of the Augsburg Confession as could not claim the character "fundamental" were not meant to be binding. This was the motive of the Des Moines Resolution with its declaration: "And we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and

²² The final adoption of it took place at the meeting of the General Synod in Washington, D. C.

so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription."

This brief review of our General Synod's confessional history shows us the importance of the Des Moines Resolution. Its intention is to fix the interpretation of a somewhat ambiguous phrase in our confessional formula. It is of such importance that it must in some way be recognized in that codification of the essential elements of our different confessional statements, as ordered by the Richmond Resolution. But how shall it be done? We could not take that sentence in the Des Moines Resolution as it there reads. Anything polemical or apologetical would throw an undignified element into that formula which must carefully be kept adapted for use in the sanctuary. Our formula must be a testimony and nothing else. How can it be done?

I would suggest that we choose a form which declares the unqualified adherence to the Augustana without saying anything of the "fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." The mere fact that we have been discussing the meaning of this phrase from the time when we received it up to this day is certainly strong reason why we should now, at a time when the General Synod orders a restatement, decide in favor of something that can not be interpreted in two or more different ways. I confess that I have pondered over this phrase for almost a quarter of a century, and I do not know what it means to-day. I know how it was understood by the fathers of our General Synod, and I know the interpretation of the Des Moines Resolution. But I am at a loss when I am to tell what the only legitimate meaning of the word is. Permit me to enumerate the interpretations which with more or less authority could be given and have been given, and let me add a few critical remarks as we go along:

1. We confess that the Augsburg Confession is a correct exhibition of the *fundamental* doctrines of the divine Word; not where it deals with *non-fundamental* doctrines of the Scriptures. So Dr. Krauth—in his earlier period—as well as Dr. S. S. Schmucker, but with this difference between them, that Dr. Schmucker took "fundamental" with reference to Christianity in general, thus excepting even the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence and holding practically not more than the Nine Points

of the Evangelical Alliance,* while Dr. Krauth took "fundamental" in reference particularly to the life and stability of the Lutheran Church, thus permitting him to except from the first twenty-one articles only Article XI, on Confession.

2. Another interpretation of our formula is that all doctrines of the Augustana are fundamental in some way. There is no inference as to non-fundamental doctrines that may be excepted from obligation. There may be non-fundamental "features" of the Confession, (errors in quotation, the conception of three sacraments instead of two as it appears especially in comparison with Melancthon's statement in the Apology, lack of clearness as to rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation in Art. X, overstatements for conciliatory purposes as in the close of Art. XXI etc.), which of course can not be included in confessional subscription. The words of our formula: "The Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word" simply intend to say that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of the *principal* articles of faith, the *chief points*; as much as to say: "There are other doctrines of the divine Word not here exhibited, but these are the principal ones, the *fundamental ones*," about in the sense of the concluding words

* 1. Divine Inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures. 2. Right and duty of man's own judgment in interpreting the Scriptures. 3. God one essence in three persons. 4. Total depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall. 5. The incarnation of the Son of God, His work of redemption for sinful mankind, his offices as Mediator and King. 6. Justification of the sinner by grace alone. 7. The work of the Holy Spirit in converting and sanctifying the sinner. 8. Immortality of the soul, resurrection of the body, judgment through the Saviour with eternal bliss for the just and eternal damnation for the Godless. 9. Divine institution of ministry and sacraments, Baptism and Lord's Supper. We note the striking similarity with our Augustana as far as the subjects are concerned; but how different from the Augustana is this "program," if we consider that as soon as it came to the details it had to be kept broad enough not to conflict with the views of the Reformed, the Methodist and even Baptists. If we think of Dr. Schmucker's deep interest in the Evangelical Alliance of which he was one of the founders—then we can understand how his conception of what was fundamental, in connection with the General Synod's formula of confessional subscription, would lead him to select from the Augustana as confessionally binding the doctrines that we have in common with other churches. Compare in connection with this an article in the *Lutheran Observer* of April 10th, 1896: "Are the Distinctive Doctrines of the Lutheran Church Fundamental?" The author reaches the conclusion that they are fundamental neither to salvation, nor to sound orthodoxy, nor to a complete system of denominational theology. He closes his article with the following words: "It is all right for those who believe these doctrines to teach them to others, and seek to lead them to accept them; but to *require* this of any as essential, in any sense, is a violation of the spirit of Christian liberty."

in the Confession: "These are the chief articles which seem to be in controversy;" "we have set forth the chief points," etc.²³ This is a view that can well go together with the Des Moines Resolution and if we could be sure that the words "fundamental doctrines" in our formula would always be understood in this way, we might leave that formula just as it is. Anyone who puts this construction on the words "fundamental doctrines" can be an honest subscriber to the Augsburg Confession. But to this interpretation there are several objections in my mind that I can never get rid of:

First. This view has the history of the General Synod against it. Men who were present at the convention of the General Synod in Harrisburg (1868) say that it was the intention to have a distinction made between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines. Concerning the fundamental doctrines they were ready to remove the "substantially correct" clause, but the idea of a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in the Augustana was so deeply rooted in their minds at that time that they would have had no thought of removing it. We know the views of Drs. Stuckenberg, Harkey, Sprecher, Schmucker and Brown; and these men, as a committee, brought in the final report.²⁴ We know that in 1875, that is seven years after the adoption of our formula in Harrisburg, Dr. Brown testified in the Allentown Church Case in favor of a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in the Augustana, counting among the first twenty-one articles seven as fundamental, one as non-fundamental, and the rest as containing a fundamental doctrine, with the express mention of one, Art. XVI, as containing things fundamental and non-fundamental.

Second. It is held by those who take this view that the difficulty disappears as soon as we remember that our formula does not speak of "fundamental doctrines" of the *Augsburg Confession*, but "*of the divine Word*," and that the emphasis must be laid upon the words: "and the Augsburg Confession a *correct exhibition* of, etc." But then others come and say that they have just the same right to paraphrase it thus: The Augsburg Con-

²³ This position is ably represented in the book: "Trial of L. A. Gotwald, p. 61; and in an article of Dr. L. S. Keyser in LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1897.

²⁴ Comp. LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 1895, p. 481.

fession a correct exhibition only in the cases where this Confession touches upon a fundamental doctrine of the divine Word.

Third. We must not forget that the phrase "fundamental doctrines" has received a certain fixed meaning in theology. The old Dogmaticians of the Lutheran Church (especially Nicol. Hunnius) formulated an elaborate system of things fundamental and non-fundamental.²⁵ We can not employ this phrase "fundamental doctrines" with the intention of interpreting it in such a general way: "the chief doctrines," the "most important," etc. *These words can not be dissociated from the meaning which they have in the history of doctrines.*

Fourth. These last remarks lead me to a thought which I can never suppress: If, according to the Des Moines Resolution, there shall be no distinction made between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, and if the words "fundamental doctrines" in our formula shall simply mean "the chief," "the most vital" doctrines of God's Word, what purpose is there then in employing these words in a confessional formula where every word must have a distinct, important meaning? Then it is an entirely superfluous phrase, and it would certainly be a pity that there has been so much discussion about it. For that only "the chief" doctrines of God's Word have been exhibited in the Augustana is so self-evident that *it needs not to be mentioned*. Such is an instruction for the class room in a Theological Seminary, but no element important enough to be embodied in a confessional form of subscription.

In concluding my critical remarks on this point let me say: I am heartily in sympathy with the intention of the Des Moines Resolution to guard against an adoption of the Augsburg Confession which after all leaves to the liberty of the individual what he wants to adopt and what not. But *as to the efforts at reconciling* this Des Moines Resolution with the phraseology of our present form of subscription and particularly with the interpretation with which our formula was accepted in Harrisburg I could never help but feel that they are after all nothing more than very laudable endeavors to make the best of the actual situation.

3. Speaking of the different interpretations to which the

²⁵ Comp. Meusel, Kirchl. Handlexikon, Vol. I, p. 217.

phrase under discussion in our formula has been subjected let me call your attention to the force of the *article*: "the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." I have always found that this raised in the minds of my students this question: Does then the Augustana contain all fundamental truth of the Scriptures? Are the doctrines which we have in the Augustana fundamental and those doctrines of the Scriptures which have not been expressed in the Confession, not fundamental? Do we here have a complete system, or body, or compendium of that which is fundamental in the Bible?²⁶ Of course, we have no such summary of all that is fundamental in the Scriptures in the Augustana. It was not intended. Our Reformers simply wanted to offer the "chief articles *which seem to be in controversy*." Let me quote some very instructive remarks of Dr. H. E. Jacobs on this question:

"Its doctrinal articles do not cover the whole compass of Christian teaching. The doctrinal portion, which ultimately became the most important portion of the Confession, was at first intended to be only a brief preface to the arraignment of abuses in the Papacy, to the preparation of which the Reformers had given their first attention. The "preface" grew, as successive misrepresentations of the Lutheran teaching, circulated at Augsburg, were found to require an answer, and that answer was given by summarizing what, on these misrepresented points, the Lutherans were actually teaching. If there had not been fanatics at Nuremberg and elsewhere in the Lutheran dominions, who repudiated the doctrine of the Trinity, and whose errors were charged to Lutheran influence, the Confession would not have contained the scientific statement of this doctrine, with which it opens. Dr. John Eck, in his 404 Theses, in circulation at Augsburg openly charged the Lutherans with the aberrations of Zwingli, concerning Original Sin. The answer was the second article, so triumphantly planting the Lutherans upon the Augustinian position, that the Roman Catholic doctors feel themselves constrained in the Confutation to come to the aid of that Pelagianism, which they had, to an extent, in common with Zwingli. In the same way each of the other articles had its

²⁶ Note, how it may change the meaning, if you say the same, but leave out the article. Dr. L. A. Gotwald formulated his adoption of the Augustana in this way: "I accept the Augsburg Confession, as in every article, a correct exhibition of fundamental divine truth." Trial of, etc., p. 51.

historical justification, and must be interpreted upon the historical background of the demands of the hour in which this great Confession was written. Every word was called out by the circumstances. Melancthon was a consummate master of the art of diplomacy, and knew well how to be silent, as well as how to express himself. The purpose of the Augustana was irenic. The effort was made to reduce the points of difference to the least amount. *General terms mark more than one passage where it was hoped to bridge over an opening chasm.* The *scholastic terminology* was called into requisition to gratify opponents. The Confession was intended to prepare the way for a discussion in which the author was not without hope of winning over his adversaries. We know how it was written and re-written and again re-written, how it was amended and enlarged, and filed and polished, until the very moment that it was called for. If the Emperor had come to Augsburg ten days earlier, or if he had delayed ten days later, we would have had, in many respects, a different Confession."—*The Lutheran*, March 5, 1908.

While we can agree with these remarks, we may yet say that one can overdo it in emphasizing that the Augustana contains nothing that was not "called out by the circumstances." This Confession covers wonderfully the field of the most essential doctrines, so that we after all have an excellent "compass of Christian teaching."²⁷ But we would never be justified in limiting the "fundamental doctrines" of the divine Word to the articles of the Augsburg Confession. Yet such is a thought suggested by our Formula.

4. It is a fact that our laymen and many of our ministers take the words "fundamental doctrines" to mean: *fundamental for salvation*. This conception is so deeply rooted in the minds of many that it will always stand in their way of catching what the synod wants to convey by that phrase. Then they argue: Is belief in the doctrine of the Trinity necessary for salvation? Is baptismal regeneration, as taught in Art. II together with Art. IX? Is the Real Presence? And so on. This delicate question regarding fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines,

²⁷ See Zoeckler, *Die Augsburgische Konfession*, p. 95. Also the *Analysis* given by Dr. Richard in his *Confessional History*, pp. 104-122.

which calls for so much instruction and discrimination must not be suggested by the Doctrinal Basis of a synod.²⁸

So we have seen that our Formula can be and has been interpreted in four different ways. But we are sure that the Confessional paragraph of a synod must be in such a form that it bears but one interpretation. There must be no ambiguity as to its meaning.

These constantly recurring discussions about the meaning of our Doctrinal Basis have a harmful effect upon the life of our synod. Some take a stricter view, others think that they must champion the old. It fosters a factional spirit and revives a great deal that now should be forgotten.

Brethren, I feel that there is a responsibility upon the General Synod now. If we do not settle this matter right we will permit an element that calls for a correction some time to drag along through another generation, an element that will, as it has done in the past, exert a confusing influence upon our General Synod in confessional matters.

If some one should object that the elimination of this phrase, in its historical meaning, would be a "change of our present Doctrinal Basis" of which there was "no intention" in that Richmond action, the reply must be given: Then the Des Moines Resolution is a change. If the Des Moines Resolution is simply an explanation of the meaning of the General Synod's confessional basis (of the meaning it must have to-day), then the elimination of a phrase which has become superfluous by that resolution is no alteration of our Basis.

The General Synod cannot now disown the Des Moines Resolution. Timidly as it came in there among resolutions of a different character, it meant a great step forward in our confessional development. A really Lutheran body cannot declare the Augustana binding only in respect to "the *fundamental* doctrines of the divine Word." What is fundamental and what is not fundamental? This is a difficult question. Philippi and Frank have here not the same views as the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, and a Lutheran theologian like Luthardt again differs from Philippi and Frank. Let us remember also that Lutheranism is not a foundation, it is a structure. If I buy a

²⁸ Read Luthardt, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre, gemeinverstaendlich dargestellt*, p. 88.

building, I buy the whole of it, not the foundation only. Whether all articles of the Augustana are fundamental or whether some or parts of them are non-fundamental—this is a question that never troubles me much. The answer depends on our definition of the term “fundamental.” I accept all in the Augustana that has, in any way, the character of *confessional substance*. This is the only distinction that we can make, the distinction between confessional and non-confessional substance. Most of those among us who insist upon the term “fundamental doctrines,” because it suggests and admits the idea of non-fundamentals in the Augustana, do not really mean to except *doctrines* of the Augustana from confessional obligation. When they speak of non-fundamentals they think of all those little things which, in the nature of the case, do not claim to be “confessional substance.” There is much more agreement among us on these matters than there sometimes seem to be.

Having now come to the close of this discourse I will sum up the suggestions made:

1. To the Scriptures must be given the priority, the precedence, the position of absolute authority as was done in our old formula. Let us keep this part as it reads, with the only change that we declare the Scriptures to “*be*” the Word of God instead of “*containing*” it, in accordance with the Richmond Resolutions.²⁹

2. As suggested by the Hagerstown Resolution let us qualify the Augsburg Confession by the term “unaltered.”³⁰

3. Let us eliminate anything that suggests a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of the Augustana.³¹

4. Let us not burden our formula with all the detailed declarations of the York and Richmond Resolutions concerning special doctrines of the Augustana, and concerning our attitude to the Secondary Confessions. The unaltered Augsburg Confession cannot be honestly accepted without including what the Secondary Confessions contain as legitimate interpretation of the great generic symbol of the Lutheran Church.

Beyond these suggestions I refuse to go at the present time.

²⁹ See Min., 1909, p. 58, 4 and p. 60, IV.

³⁰ See Min. 1895, p. 62.

³¹ See Min. 1901, p. 83.

because the General Synod has instructed its Committee on Common Service to bring in a report as to how this Doctrinal Basis might be formulated.

Only one word in closing. With all our work of arriving at a proper formulation of our confessional basis we will not forget that while it is important to be formally correct—there is a great educational value in a correct and adequate Doctrinal Basis—yet it is of greater importance for any Lutheran body really to appropriate the confessional principles of our great church. Therefore let us study our confessions, let us study them at our conferences, in our ministerial meetings, in connection with our practical work. If I was to take charge of a congregation I would use in connection with the making of my sermons the Book of Concord, being guided by its index to find out how each one of our confessions expresses the conception of a doctrinal idea that comes within the scope of my preaching. What a wealth of doctrinal and ethical expressions in Luther's Larger Catechism alone! And the confessions of our Church should be studied in connection with Luther's writings, especially his Postils, and in connection with other productions of Lutheran authors of the same character. This will help us more and more to understand the confessional principles of the Augsburg Confession which we adopt.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Expositor for Oct., 1910, contains an interesting article from the pen of E. Walter Maunder of the Royal Observatory, on "A Misinterpreted Miracle," referring to that record in Joshua concerning the standing still of the sun and moon.

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;

And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,

Until the nations had avenged themselves of their enemies.

Is it not written in the book of Joshua?

And sun stayed in the midst of heaven,

And hasted not to go down about a whole day." Joshua 10:12-13.

Mr. Maunder is an astronomer and also a devout believer. He has studied the problem from the standpoint of astronomy, of geography, of Hebrew, and of the narrative itself, and has come to the conclusion that the marginal rendering for "stand still," viz, "be silent," is correct, and that Joshua prayed for an abatement of the fierce heat at mid-day, and that the Lord answered him by sending a cloud and a terrific hail storm, which wrought havoc among the enemies of Israel and only cooled the air for the latter, so that they were enabled to pursue the fleeing Amorites "and traversed in the seven hours of the afternoon a distance which under ordinary circumstances would have been the work of an entire day."

In the same number of *The Expositor* Prof. Erdmans, of Leiden, Holland, in discussing "Ezra and the Priestly Code," declares that "the current theory about the exilic and post-exilic origin of all the laws assigned to P can not be maintained. The greater part of the laws of P must be much older than is usually assumed. It is very remarkable that our canon does not contain the Book of the Law that Ezra is said to have brought with him. I think this is an argument for the thesis that the greater part of the laws contained in our laws are older than Ezra. It

seems that only the additions to these laws that were inserted in the manuscripts have been admitted into the canon. If we think of the great honor in which Ezra was held by the successive generations of priests and scribes it is astonishing that his book is lost. Even if his laws are not handed down to us, it will be safe not to underrate the antiquity of the laws preserved by the Israelitic traditions."

Dr. Clyde W. Votaw of the University of Chicago, in the October *American Journal of Theology* discusses "Four Principles Underlying Religious Education," which are as follows: 1. Religion is the primary element in life; 2. All education is to be primarily moral-religious in aim; 3. The materials of religious education are discriminatingly inclusive; 4. The need of the child determines what is educationally to be done for him.

Frances H. Low of London, in the October *Hibbert Journal* objects to "Woman Suffrage," which is now so vigorously pressed in England, on two principal grounds: First, "There can be nothing more fatal for the nation than that women should be transformed into ardent political partisans. Women should have a moral force to be exercised at all times through the individual, the home and the society—a force higher than that wielded by any party and able to make itself felt, collectively if need be, in times of national danger. Secondly, the immediate and inevitable result of the vote would be to turn all reform, all personal effort into political questions, political movements."

The same number of the *Hibbert Journal* contains three articles on psychological themes: 1. A Dual Consciousness, 2. Philosophical Theories on Psychical Research, 3. The Fallacy of the Social Psychologist. All of these articles impress one with the thought that we have made slow progress in understanding our own minds, that there are still many unsounded depths in the realm of spirit.

The December *North American Review* contains an article by Dr. Philip Stafford Moxom on "The Child and Social Reform." He lays great stress on environment which ought to consist in (1) a good home, (2) a good school, (3) a good city (social life), and (4) a good church. He holds that the present agen-

cies are entirely adequate if properly applied. "The Church stands for the magnificent undertaking of the salvation of the world. Let us save one whole generation and its task will be enormously reduced and simplified. Can it be done? Dr. Bernardo, the founder of homes for waifs in London, out of 9556 in a given time lost only 1.84 per cent., that is out of every hundred all but a fraction less than two were saved. What does this mean? The Church prays for the coming of God's Kingdom on earth, and the logic of experience is teaching it that the Kingdom of God will come on earth only through the gateway of childhood."

Prof. J. L. Kessler, Ph.D., of Baylor University, in the October *Review and Expositor* discusses "The Preacher and Biology." He holds that methods of biology and those of theology are not incompatible, that students in both branches must be sincere and must seek nothing but truth. He deprecates all efforts to depreciate the honesty of men seeking light. He sees in the prodigious labors of biblical scholars along the line of textual criticism the true scientific spirit. Personal religion is experience, and experience is a biological phenomenon. The new birth in religion, conversion, "biology now considers no longer alien but natural.... a merging of self into a larger personality..... In other words, the unconverted are the abnormal and pathological, suffering from the effects of arrested development." "The biological view of nature includes God in it."

"Miracles and History," by Professor William Hallock Johnson in the October "*Princeton Review*," is an able discussion of a subject of lasting interest. The historian is bound to weigh the evidence for miracle as offered by the indubitable testimony of the sacred writers. He, however, must be a theist to give this testimony its true value. This evidence seems conclusive in favor of miracles. They can not be explained away by the attempted interpretations of naturalism or of those who think that they must be apologized for. "The question of miracles is not indifferent. 'It is not miracles that matter,' Harnack has said, 'the question on which everything turns is whether we are helplessly yoked to an inexorable necessity, or whether a God exists who rules and governs, and whose power to compel nature we

can move by prayer and make a part of our experience.' It is precisely here that miracle becomes a support to theistic faith, for it answers this important question and answers it unmistakably in the affirmative."

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M.

Formal completeness demands a review this quarter of recent publications in the various departments of Old Testament. Though there have been no startling discoveries and no very unusual propositions of theories in Old Testament study, there have yet been interesting developments of late and a general advance along the whole line of investigation is manifest. The decided trend at present is to lay greatest stress upon the investigation of comparative religions in their bearing upon the Old Testament. The influence of the religio-historical school as a distinct theological method has for some time made itself felt in the department of Old Testament and is without doubt the most important factor now to be reckoned with.

Our review of current theology and thought pertaining to the Old Testament must begin with the chronicle of the death of a highly merited scholar in a field closely connected with the Old Testament. Emil Schürer of Göttingen passed away on April 30th. This is one of six important losses recently sustained by the ranks of investigators in the field of Jewish literature. Bruno Baentsch (Jena) and Justus Köberle (Rostock) died in 1908; Adelbert Merx (Heidelberg) and Adolph Kamphausen (Bonn) in 1909; and now Emil Kautzsch (Halle) and Emil Schürer in 1910. Schürer's chief merit lay in his thorough and exhaustive work, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols., 4th edition, 1907), and in his joint-editorship with Harnack of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. His position on the editorial staff of this paper was at once upon his death assumed by his son-in-law Herman Schuster and by Arthur Titius (Göttingen) and it was announced that Harnack would withdraw from the staff at the end of this year. At the same time the readers were assured that the inner continuity of the paper would be preserved and that the dominating spirit would be in entire conformity with its past. But in a November number the editors address a lengthy letter to their readers

and ask whether something could not be done to make the paper conform even more than at present with the constantly progressive spirit of modern investigation. The answer is this: "We are deeply impressed with the fact that the method of historical religion has attained a very special significance in every department of scientific theology. We regard it imperative, therefore, that we should thoroughly orientate our readers on this aspect of theology by means of critical reviews covering this entire field." This is a sign of the times.

Schürer though practically unrivaled in his chosen field leaves behind him an able corps of workers along the same line. The literature of late Judaism and the history of the Diaspora are assiduously investigated to-day along three lines of inquiry, in Egypt, in Babylon, and in Palestine, even as the primitive Hebrew origins are sought for in these three places. A significant contribution has recently been made to the sources of our information concerning the Jews in Egypt. It consists of three noteworthy papyri discovered by Rubenson at Elephantine on the site of the ancient Jeb and just across the Nile from the ancient Assuan where Sayce and Cowley not long since discovered the family archives of a prominent Jewish family of the sixth century B. C. The Rubenson documents are in Aramaic, are dated 408-407, and comprise (a) a copy of a letter written by the priest Jedoniah and his colleagues in the fortress Jeb and directed to Bagoas the Persian governor in Judea, (b) an incomplete duplicate of the letter, and (c) a brief sketch of a semi-official answer to the letter.

The story told by these documents is this: the Jewish community in Jeb ignoring the deuteromic law had built its own temple before Cambyses conquered Egypt in 525. While the form of this temple cannot be determined with precision, it is certain that it differed essentially from the one in Jerusalem. Cambyses at the time of his conquest destroyed all the temples of the Egyptians but spared that of the Jews. The Egyptian priests therefore regarded the Jewish cult with extreme scorn and in 411 in the absence of the Persian governor Arsham, the priests of the god Chnub in Elephantine conspired with the commander of the fortress and destroyed the Jewish temple there. The malefactors were soon brought to justice and executed but the temple was not rebuilt. The Jews had therefore applied to

the high priest Jochanan in Jerusalem but had received no assistance (doubtless on the ground that they were schismatics). They now apply to Bagoas the Persian governor in Jerusalem and at the same time to the sons of Sanballat the governor in Samaria. These efforts meet with success and the answer signed by Bagoas and Delaiah, one of the sons of Sanballat, directs Arsham the governor of Elephantine to rebuild the Jewish temple, it being stipulated that the offerings made in the new building shall consist only of food and incense and not of animals (doubtless because the sacrifice of animals which in this case would consist chiefly of rams was specially offensive to the worshippers of Chnub).

These papyri have been carefully edited by Smend and Staerk, published by Lietzmann, translated by Sachau, and commented on at some length by Schürer, Gunkel, Bousset, and many others. They are held to constitute a valuable source of information concerning the history of late Judaism, especially concerning the Egyptian Diaspora of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ, and to justify a much earlier dating of that Diaspora than has hitherto been considered justifiable. New historical perspectives are opened to view. Much light is shed upon Jewish customs and ideas in the sixth and fifth centuries. The prophecy of Isaiah 19:18 sqq. concerning Egypt and his protest against the building of temples, chapter 66, are set in clear light and need no longer be referred to so late a date as the Maccabean or the Samaritan time. The Jahveh cult existed in Egypt as early as the middle of the sixth century and that too with its own temple. In short, taken together with the recent valuable discoveries of the Americans at Nippur these Elephantine documents would seem to warrant the conclusion that ever since the Babylonian exile Judaism had three distinct centers of existence: Judea, Egypt, and Babylon.

The problem of Hebrew origins finds many suggested solutions, the latest being that of our own Dr. Clay in his "Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites" (*vide LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, Vol. XL, p. 275 sqq.). Of course the largest number of scholars are still interested in tracing the connections between the civilization of Babylon and that of the Israelites. Prof. Clay's theory has not had time as yet to make much impression upon the Germans, although it has not passed without flatter-

ing notice. In a lengthy appreciative review of the book in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* of Oct. 28, 1910, König calls attention to the epoch-making significance of the new theory if well grounded, but expresses his own scepticism as to Clay's results and asks for time for independent investigation of the matter. So that for the present the astral-mythological interpretation of Hebrew origins still holds the field of interest. But the monotony of Pan-Babylonianism has been effectually disturbed occasionally by those who claim even greater dependence of Israel upon the intellectual and religious life of Egypt than upon that of Babylon. And it is just possible that we shall soon witness the spectacle of a virulent struggle over Israel by the Pan-Babylonists on the one hand and the Pan-Egyptists on the other, and unless they succeed in effectually maiming or devouring each other, Israel may be compelled once more to go into exile, mostly to Babylon but a remnant to Egypt.

The Egyptian hypothesis finds a typical representative in Völter's *Aegypten und die Bibel*, which has just appeared in a revised fourth edition. The Excavations at Tell-el-Mutesselem (Megiddo), he claims, have revealed that until the beginning of the eighth century B. C. the predominating influence in Palestine was not Babylonian or Assyrian but Phœnician, Mycenaean, and, above all, Egyptian. This last he shows then in the primitive narratives of the Old Testament. Egyptian mythology furnishes the material which when wrought into the narrative form of history constitutes the basis for all the Hebrew traditions of the days before King Saul. Joseph, for example, is merely a Hebrew adaptation of the Egyptian god Osiris. Like Joseph Osiris is the "beloved son" of his father, of special beauty and rank. He too descends in order to arise anew. He suffers at the hands of his brother. Joseph is thrown into a cistern; Osiris into a floating chest; both reach Egypt. Osiris rules in a prison, namely, the kingdom of the dead. The story of Potiphar's wife has its counterpart in Egyptian tales. The account of Moses' brazen serpent in the wilderness grows out of the worship in Heroopolis of the serpent-headed god Tum and out of the Egyptian custom of setting the sacred animals upon a pole. The march around the walls of Jerico is simply the Hebrew version of the ancient jubilee celebration in the worship of the Egyptian gods, which consisted of festive processions around

their temples. These parallels that Völter traces between Egypt and Israel are said by Egyptologists to be without any real inner connections. Bodies of tradition which happen to manifest similarities and analogies at some points cannot for that reason be regarded as essentially related, as a study of Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* and his explanations of *Mythos und Religion* would have shown. The kernel of truth that may be hidden in Völter's representations is lost in the mass of his exaggerations.

Along this same line a Catholic scholar Mader in an interesting investigation concerning the origin of human sacrifice among the ancient Hebrews (*Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker*) comes to the conclusion that the Israelitish worship of Moloch is of Egyptian origin. His argument is not convincing but it is one of the indications of the present trend. In this connection mention should also be made of a work by A. Alt, *Israel und Aegypten*, in which the author very ably discusses the political relation between the Pharaohs and the kings of Israel and Judah in three periods: Sheshonk and Solomon, Assyrians and Ethiopians, Necho and Nebuchadnezzar.

The other theory of Hebrew origins, Pan-Babylonism, continues to hold the center of interest in the study of comparative religions as applied to the Old Testament, and the literature on the subject bulks large. The sensational element in the proposition with which Delitzsch startled the theological world in 1902 has passed. The slogan "Babel-Bibel" has died away into silence. But the scholarly world was quick to perceive that a real problem was involved, and this has given direction to the investigations of many learned scholars from that day to this. Their number is ever increasing and many views that a few years ago were the subjects of heated controversy have to-day become common property of scientific thought. Many theologians, among them the most conservative, are ready to admit a real cultural influence of Babylon upon Israel in writing and industry, in customs and laws, in cosmology, forms of worship, and eschatological hopes. Their only concern now is to ascertain the degree of the influence, to prevent exaggerations and unwarranted assumptions, and above all to establish the distinctive peculiarity and admitted superiority of Israel in matters religious. The work has now advanced sufficiently to justify a review of achievements, and not a few efforts have been made recently to add up

the gains and losses and strike a balance. Of these we may mention the following: Köberle, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Israel und Babylon*, 1908 (posthumous, specially adapted to orientate on this question); Wilke, *Die astralmythologische Weltanschauung und das Alte Testament* (against Winckler); A. Jerimias, *Der Einfluss Babyloniens auf das Verständnis des Alten Testaments* (emphasizing that influence); R. Kittel, *Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen*, 1910 (positive, concise, clear, impartial, judicious); Erbt, *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (advocating the Pan-Babylonism of Winckler, intended for teachers); Sellin, *Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der anderen altorientalischen*; König, *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes*.

In a series of four articles in the current volume of the *Neue Kirchle Zeitschrift*, Ed. König gives a brief but comprehensive statement of the facts that he believes to have been established in the course of the recent investigations on this entire subject of the relation between Babylon and the Old Testament. The series is called *Babylonische Kultur und alttestamentliche Ideenwelt*... In the first article he recounts the points of contact or of similarity that must be admitted to have existed between the civilization of Babylon and that of Israel. He makes the preliminary point however that in spite of any influence that may have been exerted by Babylon upon Israel there may have been particular individuals and branches of families that resisted all foreign influence (e. g. the Rechabites) and that Israel or at least her leading spirits may have maintained throughout her history certain cultural principles as the distinguishing characteristics of their nation.

Among the unquestionable elements of correspondence he mentions first that of language. Similarities in sound and sense of words and even in idioms are easily discernable and König claims to have traced them in detail in his new (1910) Hebrew-Aramaic lexicon (a book which has been very favorably criticised). The poetries of the two peoples also show interesting correspondences in parallelisms, in text and rhythm, and in responsories. These similarities are explained on the ground that both Babylonians and Hebrews are Semites and closely related through Abraham.

Moreover in external conditions of civilization, as for example,

in the construction of canals and the building of arches, in weights, measures, and coins, in rites and ceremonies, and in all kinds of agricultural, astronomical, and mathematical achievements, the two peoples stood on about the same level. In ethical standards and moral practices close, but not exact, parallels are to be observed. Thus the institution of concubinage and the corresponding rights of inheritance are very similar in the account of Hagar (Gen. 16 and 21) and in the law of Hammurabi (Sec. 170), but not without essential points of difference.

In the sphere of religion, König admits that sooth-saying is mutual, but remarks that in Babylonia and Assyria sooth-saying is nearly always based upon the observation of omens, in Israel never. He also draws the important and original distinction that sooth-saying is an element of Israelitish civilization but by no means of Old Testament thought. But there are integral elements of religion, equally emphasized by both peoples. Such are the prayers to heaven for benefits, the altars to the deity, and the offering of sacrifices both of gratitude and of expiation. Concerning these König remarks: "These correspondences in matters of worship show that the Old Testament religion does not pretend in all its parts to rest upon direct divine revelation in the sense of disclosure. They are to be explained on the ground that God in constructing the form of worship pleasing to Himself permitted His agents in Israel to make use of certain elements of universal religion.... These correspondences are to be accounted for in part by the racial relationships existing between the two peoples,.... and in part by the law of parallel development of contemporaneous nations living under like geographical conditions. We can scarcely speak of direct borrowing."

In the other three articles König emphasizes the fundamental differences between Babel and Bible. And first as to language. Recent excavations in Palestine prove immense differences in vocabulary between the language of Canaan and that of Babylon (a fact entirely overlooked by Clay in his "Amurru"). Moreover, Abraham and the other Hebrews needed no interpreters in Canaan (e. g. Gen. 23), whereas the Assyrians are said to speak a language incomprehensible to the Israelites (Deut. 28:49). And nowhere is there the slightest intimation that the late Hebrews had to translate their older literature from the Babylonian

language. We note also important differences in the measures employed by the two peoples, the Hebrews employing the decimal system, the Babylonians the sexagesimal; in the time of beginning the year, the Hebrews in the Fall, the Babylonians in the Spring; in the names of the stars; and in the names of the months.

In the forms of worship also there are fundamental differences. The Babylonian divination of omens does not exist in the real "Israel of God" and the practice of sooth-saying is condemned wherever mentioned. The rite of circumcision existed, it is true, in Egypt but certainly not in Babylon. The same is true of the distinction between clean and unclean animals. The Babylonians in contrast with the Israelites did not limit themselves in their sacrifice to the products of herd and field but offered up honey and indeed products of all kinds. Babylon had its analogy to the Hebrew Sabbath, but with these essential differences: first, in the manner of its recurrence; second, in the fact that the Babylonian Sabbath was an evil day of fear when even offerings were forbidden; and third, in the fact that the Babylonian Sabbath was a day not for rest but for more business than the ordinary day. Then, too, the Babylonians made images of their gods and worshipped them, and that openly.

Above all in the sphere of religious faith the difference is vast and fundamental. It is nothing less than the sharp opposition of polytheism and monotheism. König here combats the thesis of Friederich Delitzsch that the monotheism of the Bible has come from Babel, and that of Alfred Jeremias that monotheistic tendencies are to be observed among the "wise" of Babylon. The history of Babylonian-Assyrian religion does indicate at times the practice of henotheism or monolatry but never of monotheism. Joshua 24:21 sqq. and many other passages clearly indicate that the religious consciousness of the Israelites centered about their monotheistic faith,—the conviction that the call of Abraham began a new era in the relationship between God and man.

The question of the relation between the primitive narratives in the Bible (Gen. 1-11) and similar stories in Babylonian lore is subjected to a lengthy review in the light of the most recent developments. Nearly twenty pages are devoted to a summation of the evidence in the case of the flood narrative. Large

emphasis is placed upon the significance of the Babylonian version most recently discovered by Hilprecht. It is considered the most authoritative and original of the four now known. Special attention is given to the latest utterances of Delitzsch and especially of Gunkel in the recent new edition of his commentary on Genesis. The conclusion in the whole matter is that there are really no good grounds for the wide-spread assumption that the Babylonian account was borrowed by the Israelites through the medium of the Canaanite civilization. Far better grounds are there for holding that those features of the account which are common to both the Babylonian and the Biblical narrative are the ancient heritage of the nations which once wandered over the face of western Asia. This common heritage was handed down from generation to generation among the Babylonians as well as the descendants of Abraham and underwent parallel courses of development among each people. And certainly the Biblical account represents the most ancient stage of the inner, spiritual, religious development of the human race.

Finally it is shown how utterly without foundation in fact is the contention of Winckler, Gunkel, Jeremias, *et al.*, that the historiography of the Old Testament has been formally and materially influenced by Babylonian mythology. Evidence is outlined to disprove the ingenious hypothesis that Abraham represents the moon-god, that the narrative of Moses is simply the Hebrew edition of the legend of King Sargon, that Joseph is the god Tammuz-Adonis or the goddess Astarte, and that the story of David embodies the myth of Marduk. Thus the independence and originality of the Old Testament historical narratives is maintained and their essential historicity and trust-worthiness is vindicated.

Bearing on this last point there has just appeared a small work by W. Lotz, *Abraham, Isaak, und Jakob*, 1910, (*Bibl. Zeit- und Streitfragen*, V. 10), in which the various theories as to the patriarchal narratives are critically reviewed and the historicity of the patriarchs is defended.

We do not pretend in the foregoing to have mentioned all of the important recent publications bearing on the Old Testament but only some of them, sufficient we hope to indicate the trend of current investigations.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY. OBERLIN, OHIO.

The Person of Christ: A Consideration of the Homiletic Value of the Biblical Views of the Nature of that Person, by Edward H. Merrell, D.D., LL.D., lately President, and Professor of Philosophy in Ripon College. Cloth, 12mo. Pp. 192. 90 cents net. Postpaid, \$1.00.

The ripe fruit of theological and educational experience is given in these ten lectures of Dr. Merrell. The healthy criticism of over-liberal modern movements furnishes ethical and Biblical data for the confirmation of religious truth as taught by the Christian Church.

The Person of Christ is first treated in relation to the Godhead and the historical divine record; then follows the soteriological relation of the Person to the world's redemption and regeneration, the Kingdom, Evangelization, Retribution, and Endless Future.

The purview is clear and concise, along lines of accepted traditional positions. In lecture VI, which treats of regeneration, Dr. Merrell distinguishes between conversion and regeneration, but confuses their relation to the believing subject.

He states that regeneration is the result of co-operation of the believing recipient with God. But *palin genesis* is the sole act of God. Regeneration is a begetting, a birth, a creation. The man in sin is dead; rebirth comes from God.

Justification is an act solely of God *for* the believing subject; regeneration is an act solely of God *upon* the believing subject. The conditions which make regeneration possible are produced and characterized by precursory influences from God through illumination and prevenient divine acts of grace. *Energeia* precedes *sunergeia*.

God begins the work of saving grace and makes man spiritually alive, before man spiritually works, or co-operates.

In treating the subject of Retribution and Endless Future sufficient care is not taken in the use of the term *aionios*, and the character of punishment is quite lost in the chief stress placed upon everlastingness.

But the strength of the book is to be fully felt and recognized in the totality of its clear and forceful effect upon the reader. The themes have been for long thought over and effectively handled.

M. COOVER.

METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE. SHANGHI AND FOO CHOW,
CHINA.

The Word For God in Chinese. By Rev. C. A. Stanley, D.D.,
American Board Missionary, Tientsin, China.

The translation of divine terms and of more or less technical religious terms, represents great difficulties to those upon whom the responsibility rests of giving God's Word to the nations of the earth. None present greater difficulties than the name of God. The above brochure of Dr. Stanley is in proof thereof. No doubt the first missionaries followed what they conceived the proper plan when they used the most popular word for God in China. The same is true largely in India, where the word "Swami" in former times was largely used for the designation of Lord, although anybody was lord. Dr. Stanley rightly contends, and he has history on his side, that if possible the generic word for God in every nation should be the term used. But just here is where the difficulty arises and in nations which have a long history in religious development, it is difficult to determine which are the generic terms. It is sufficient to say Dr. Stanley thinks "Shen" is the word in Chinese and ought to be employed for God instead of "Shangti." But he has against him a pretty large consensus of opinion among scholars and missionaries, who have used "Shangti," and "Shen," the word he thinks ought to be used for God, is the word by which they translate "Spirit."

What makes the situation more critical in Chinese, is that the party which stands for unity is employing "Shangti," as above indicated. Their argument is that it matters not so much what term is used, only so there is general agreement. The word can be filled with the Christian idea and the more people who will use it so filled, the stronger will grow the conception of God. All terms in Chinese are inadequate to express the Hebrew and Christian conception of the term "God." India missionaries have passed through the same contention in regard to terminology. The contention now is, if possible, to get consensus of opinion among the various missionaries. Dr. Stanley puts up a strong argument for "Shen" as the proper word. If his contention be right it seems rather strange that the translators should urge "Shangti," when "Shen" is so manifestly the more appropriate word and the one that stands for the generic idea. One thing may be said however, that the party against whom he contends, seems more influential and much stronger than his party, and that unless he has every reasonable ground for hope that he can influence missionaries of the present time, he would very much better throw the weight of his energy into the effort of educating the Christian Church into the conception of God as revealed in God's Word, apart from the terms used, and this

because the terms for "God" in Hebrew, while all very significant, must all be taken together to give us the Bible conception of God. In India the storm has waged around the *unpronounceable* Hebrew term for "God," popularly pronounced "Jehovah." Remembering this unsettled contention we fully appreciate both Dr. Stanley's position and that of the Chinese missionaries who urge against him. If Dr. Stanley is right then evidently "Shen" will be equal to "Deva" in India—the "Shiner"—which is the commonest term found for "God" in all translations of the India vernaculars.

L. B. WOLF.

FUNK & WAGNALS COMPANY. NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Science of Poetry and the Philosophy of Language by Hudson Maxim. \$2.50 net.

Mankind will be forever defining, reducing to its lowest atomic element whatever stuff the human hand lays hold of, fixing in its proper class each thing as it is found to be an entity. So determined is one to definitely locate and name that nothing misses his notice. Each star must be marked in its orbit; the return of the comets can be predicted; each atomic crumb must have its name. No distance alarms the confident astronomer; the microscope reveals the inscrutable infinitesimal. We must know every thing and give to everything its law. This is a universe governed by law, certain, unchangeable. Learn the law that governs any action and your eternal relation to that law is fixed. So the scientist, the philosopher, assures us that we may arrive at absolute certainty and fixity; every man with a sufficient knowledge of mathematics and chemistry and physics may become a prophet more believable than any ancient seer. There's no safe guessing any more. The wishing stone has been dissolved, analyzed. The brain is a congeries of atoms.

This passion for definition seems strange in a world confessedly infinite, immeasurable, indefinable. Eternity there and here, yet man claps together the doors of morning and evening and says, "Eternity is nothing, one day is all we have." Yet even the theologians have set the pace for defining and have dared to tell us what God is, as if the Almighty and Eternal could be measured with a yard stick.

Despite all this confidence in defining there is something elusive in this very alluring and fascinating universe. That's what makes it so interesting. Could we but know all we should be most miserable. Our happiness consists in following gleams, not in defining fireflies, finding them only bugs. Beacons of eternity are as interesting as eintag fliegen. Yesterday a professor wrote a volume on *The Final Philosophy* and to-day Her-

bert Spencer gave us his Synthetic Philosophy, which is now fit subject for the dusting cloth. So soon does one's definition need new defining.

Well, here in this volume, whose title stands yonder at the head of this review, a noted inventor of a machine gun that can hit the mark and of smokeless powder that can blow us all to kingdom come—Hudson Maxim—cocksure of many things, announces a definition of that most elusive thing, poetry—and a fixed principle of that most fluctuating thing—language. Has he forgotten that every man, each being a poet in the germ, has in him

“Thoughts hardly to be packed

Into a narrow act,

Fancies that broke through language and escaped.”

But, no, he would define poetry and establish a law by which everyone may write or at least test a poem.

What is poetry? Carlyle asserts that it is “the most perfect speech of man, that in which he comes nearest to being able to utter the truth.” But it's only, you see, Mr. Maxim, an approximation, not to be defined. Poetry laughs at your laws, sir. It belongs to infinity, to eternity. Do you remember those lines Lowell put into the mouth of Columbus?

“And I believed the poets; it is they

Who standing at the central truth

And listening to the inner flow of things

Speak to the world out of Eternity.”

Yes, the poet is the mouthpiece of the Eternal.

Do you recall those lines from the poem of Bailey's Faustus?

“Poetry is itself a thing of God;

He made his prophets poets; and the more

We feel of poesie do we become

Like God in love and power—undermakers.”

These are not included in the list of great poetic lines marshalled at the close of this pretentious volume. Nor indeed does one find here many, many more lines that have the eternal, indefinable quality of true poetry in them.

This great big book may make a stir in the world. But in the face of such an inventor of guns and powder I dare to say that this book will cause only harmless explosions like those one hears on the testing grounds when new guns and new powder are being tried, or on Independence Day when noise is regnant. One can hardly predict eternal fame for Mr. Maxim as a writer of this book. No, he will continue to be justly famous for guns and powder and such like, but literary criticism is not chemical analysis, nor the science of poetry like the science of explosives. We catch only at the form of this goddess; loving her with undying ardor, pursuing her with changeless loyalty, daring all for her smiles, we catch only the gleam of her matchless eyes, hear

the rustle of her swiftly flowing garments, but ever following her in the sure faith that in the far-off, eternal fields we shall at last come up with her and wreath of the fadeless flowers she plucks for us a garland of immortal youth.

D. W. WOODS.

COCHRANE PUBLISHING CO., TRIBUNE BUILDING, NEW YORK.

Logic and Imagination in the Perception of Truth. By J. Rush Stoner, M.A. Pp. 383.

There is a sub-title to this book, *The Nature of Pure Activity in two series. Book I and Book II.*

In the preface the author indicates both his purpose and his method in the preparation of this volume. As to his purpose, or motive he says:

"If this little book shall strengthen the belief in immortality, revive the faith of the Eternal Presence, suggest some good and faithful way of actualizing the teleological principle in life, restore the freshness of a withered hope, show the way in any degree to the establishment of a permanent rational faith, inspire some aspiring life with a little good-will and happiness of social relations in the Citadel of Peace, and encourage the strongly brave spirit of universal conquest under the commission of Truth to some worthy achievement in the realm of science, literature, or art—the author shall deem it a recompense."

As to his method, he says this: "The plan has been to take note of some of the scientific investigators and philosophers whose works have been epoch-making influences in the past; and probably the nearest approach to physical science is a sketch of the principle of motion that represents double parallelism, "X" radiation, balance and equilibrium of gravitating centers, equality and inequality in the distribution of energy, the corresponding curves described by the different centers in motion, and the influence of the mechanical and dynamical; since this seems to be suggestive of the relation of mechanism and teleology."

We have found it impossible to give sufficient time to the examination of the volume to give a critical estimate of the success with which the author has accomplished the task to which he has thus set himself. It has seemed to us, however, that his style is unnecessarily abstract and abstruse. If, as he says, the book "is an attempt to review some scientific and philosophic principles within the ordinary modes of research and the categories of the plain man's way of thinking," we fear that this same "plain man" would have great difficulty in following him, and would hardly be able to recognize his own "way of thinking" as it is here explained.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

The Development of Religion. A Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology. By Irving King, Ph.D., State University, Iowa. Cloth. Pp. xxiii, 371. Price \$1.75 net.

This book is a labored attempt to prove that religion—false and true—is the product of evolution rather than of revelation. It is characterized by the vagueness of the new psychology. Indeed, to the average reader it has little more meaning than an effort to exclude the supernatural from the experience of men. The inquiry, which the author proposes to investigate, does not contemplate the relation of the supernatural to the human mind. He says, "In the science of religion, therefore, we do not need to discuss the question as to whether there may be a connection between the natural and the supernatural. There may be a connection, but the categories of experience are not capable of describing it."

Now right here is the weakness of the work and of practically all other books which profess to discuss the history or the development of religion from a purely psychological or naturalistic standpoint. The question of a connection between the supernatural and the natural must from the nature of the case, it seems to us, be a fundamental one in a discussion of religion. Until the fact and nature of such a contention be determined how is it possible to analyze the attitude and the experience of the mind? If our author frankly disavowed his disbelief in the supernatural, we might understand him; but he acknowledges that there *may be* a connection and yet that this connection must be ignored. He holds, with agnostics in general, that "the scientific examination of religion cannot, of course, deny the reality of supernatural elements in the various contents and processes of the religious consciousness. It simply holds that the relation of the one to the other is such as can not be described in phenomenal terms." That this is true is not at all evident, for there are thousands of intelligent people who profess to know God through experience.

As an illustration of the author's style and method we quote from the preface: "As regards the viewpoint it is, in a word, that the religious attitude has been *built up* through the overt activities which appear in primitive social groups, activities which were either spontaneous and playful or which appeared with reference to meeting various practical needs of the life-process; and that the development of emotional values has been mediated through the fact that these activities were in the main social."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Religions of Eastern Asia. By Horace Grant Underwood, D.D. Cloth. Pp. ix, 267, 5 1-4 x 8. Price \$1.50 net.

This is the fourth series of lectures on "The Charles F. Deems Lectureship of Philosophy" in the New York University. Dr. Underwood is qualified to speak on his subject from the fact that he is a missionary in Korea, which may be said to be a "nation born in a day." He has a first-hand knowledge of present day facts in reference to oriental religions. He finds them all deficient in those elements of universality, truth and love which characterize Christianity as the absolute religion. As one reads again the descriptions of these vague, incomprehensible and unsatisfying religions, he blesses God for the simple and beautiful revelation which He has given of Himself in His Word and through His Son.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections, Made Ready for Pulpit Work. By R. C. H. Lenski, Vol. I, First of Advent to Trinity Sunday. Cloth. Pp. 664.

The author, in agreement with many others, holds that the "old gospel and epistle pericopes" are too fragmentary because the texts for sermons on Wednesdays and Fridays, which were necessary to complete the system, have been omitted. Hence, he has followed one of the later systems called "Eisenach," which, it is claimed, is more connected than the one generally used. The treatment which he gives is after the order of Nebe, whose work may be judged from the late Dr. E. J. Wolf's "Exposition of the Gospels."

The author has done his part well. The expositions are sound and the language simple. If, however, the defining part of the title "made ready for pulpit work" should lead an indolent pastor to expect ready-made sermons, he will be disappointed. The book supplies material in convenient form on which the preacher is to "work."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Lutheran Annual, 1911. Pp. 80. Price 10 cents

This annual contains the usual almanac and list of pastors, teachers, &c., of the Synodical Conference. In as much as it ignores all other Lutheran bodies its title is somewhat misleading.

We beg leave to acknowledge the reception of the photograph in a neat oval brass frame of the late Dr. C. F. W. Walther, the founder of the Missouri Synod, the centenary of whose birth will occur October 25th, 1911. This is apparently an excellent likeness of this noble man of God and will be welcomed by his friends and admirers.

Beiträge zur praktischen Behandlung der Biblischen Geschichte. New Testament, von W. Wegner, Lehrer an der Ev.-luth. Immanuels-schule zu St. Charles, Mo. Seiten 298, 5 x 7, in Leinwand. Price \$1.00.

These contributions to a practical treatment of N. T. themes impress us very favorably. They are intended for use in Parochial Schools as a manual for teachers and others. The book will be welcomed by all Christians into whose hands it shall fall. "Shut-in" saints will find here edifying and simple expositions of over seventy interesting events of the N. T.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

World Missionary Conference, 1910, held at Edinburg, Scotland.

Nine volumes. Size 5 x 7 1-2 inches.

These nine volumes, varying in number of pages from about 200 to nearly 600, contain a complete report of the proceedings and addresses of the greatest missionary convention ever held on this globe. It represented every land which has been reached by the gospel. It aroused universal interest and was attended by the most distinguished Protestant clergy and laity of the whole earth. It was a great missionary business meeting at which large and far reaching plans for the evangelization of the world were discussed by specialists from the home and the foreign field.

The first eight volumes embody the results of the study and the inquiries of as many commissions on the following subjects: 1. Carrying the Gospel to All the non-Christian World; 2. The Church in the Mission Field; 3. Education; 4. The Missionary Message; 5. The Preparation of Missionaries; 6. The Home Base of Missions; 7. Missions and Governments; 8. Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity. Each of these volumes has an index. The ninth volume contains the "History, Records and Addresses" of the Convention and a comprehensive index to the entire series.

Every possible phase of the problem of the conversion of the world is discussed. The wisdom and experience of the workers abroad and the secretaries and boards at home are collated and made available for study. It must follow that the whole vast

matter of missions will become more intelligible, and the stupendous task more possible to the faithful student of the facts here presented.

The nominal cost of these volumes puts them within reach of all ministers, none of whom should deny himself the profit of their early possession.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Song of Songs. By William A. Quayle. 50 pp. 7 3-4 x 3 in. Artistic paper binding. Price 35 cents net.

This is a running comment on the "Song of Solomon" written in the picturesque and striking style for which Bishop Quayle is justly famous. He treats it as a purely pastoral poem, and pronounces it "the sweetest pastoral poem of ancient literature."

One is tempted to quote, so as to give a taste of the delights which are in store for the reader of this charming booklet. But where all is so delightful it is difficult to decide what to quote or when to stop. Take this as an example: "This lord of the lute who went bareheaded in the star-rise to write this meadow song, was one who had camped many and many a night with nothing to cover him save the coverlet of the black-blue sky dotted with stars, and woke at the dawn with the dewdrops glistening at sunrise in his tangled hair. When he sings I feel the meadow scent and walk amidst the apple trees. He is not talking about nature. He is out with nature. He is not admiring; he is absorbing. Nothing stilted can you find in any line or sentiment. All is free as birds which fly whatsoever way they will."

The mechanical work, paper, type, arrangement, binding, everything, is exquisite, all done in the most artistic way, so as to make it a delight to the eye, and to a refined taste. Nothing could be found better suited to be used as a gift to a friend of refined and dainty taste.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Social Ministry. An Introduction to the Study and Practice of Social Science. Edited for the Methodist Federation of Social Service by the Editorial Secretary, Harry F. Ward. Pp. viii, 318. Price, \$1.00 net.

This volume is composed of twelve lectures, or addresses, by as many different men. Yet there is a unity of purpose running through the volume, determining the subjects discussed and the order in which the chapters are arranged. This purpose is stated thus in the preface—"The plan of the volume is to sketch in broad outline the historical basis of our social service move-

ment and the problems raised by the industrial organization of life, then to discuss some specific forms of social service by those whose lifework has been given to them."

Most of those who have contributed towards this volume are recognized as experts in their several departments, and in the subjects which they discuss. For example we have a chapter on "The Social Ministry of Jesus" by President Rall of the Iliff School of Theology, Denver; one on "The Social Activities of John Wesley," by President Little of Garrett Biblical Institute; one on "The Industrial Revolution" by Prof. George E. Vincent of the University of Chicago; one on "The Helpless in Industry," by Mary E. McDowell, Head Resident of the University of Chicago Settlement; one on "Constructive Philanthropy" by Edward T. Devine, Gen. Sec. of the Charity Organization Society of New York City; one on "The Needy Child," by Homer Folks, Secretary of the State Charities Aid Association of New York; another on "The City and the Kingdom," by Frank Mason North, Sec. of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society. Such men can speak with authority and deserve an attentive hearing.

Each chapter is followed by a quite full "Bibliography," giving the books that have been consulted, or that may be used in a further study of the subject. This is a very commendable feature of the volume, and adds very much to its value. We can heartily commend this book to ministers and students, and to all who are interested in this line of work.

The mechanical work is well done as is usual with all the publications of this house.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Lesson Handbook, 1911. A concise commentary on the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons for the entire year. By Henry H. Meyer, Asst. Ed. of S. S. Publications of the M. E. Church, with an Introduction by John I. McFarland, Editor. Leather binding, 3 x 6. Pp. 176. Price 25 cents net.

This is an excellent pocket edition of comments on the Sunday School lessons. The explanations are simple and to the point. Each lesson has an historical introduction, the text in full, an explanation, a brief review of the salient facts of the lesson, and some questions "for future discussion."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

G. P. PUTNAM SONS. NEW YORK.

The Political Theories of Martin Luther. By Luther Hess Waring, Ph.D. Pp. vi, 293. Price \$1.50 net.

This attractive volume is an interesting and important addi-

tion to our Luther literature, and that too along a line that is practically new. It is really much more than this. It is a broad and scholarly discussion, along general lines, of the subject of political science, as presented in the various chapter headings, such as *The Native Necessity and Origin of the State*, *The Sovereignty of the State*, *The Right of Reform and Revolution*, *The Objects of the State*, *The Functions of the State*, and *The Limits of the State*. Under each topic the various views that have prevailed are clearly stated, and the best authorities are quoted in support of each theory from Aristotle down to the present day, with copious reference in the foot notes to the writings of the authorities themselves.

But, of course, as the title suggests, the chief purpose of the author is to present Luther's views on these several topics, and this is done in a very full and satisfactory way. Not only are his views clearly stated by Dr. Waring, according to his understanding of them, but many copious quotations are given from Luther's own writings, so that the reader may be able to judge for himself as to the fairness of the representations made.

As one reads these page after page his wonder must grow constantly at the many-sidedness of the great Reformer, and at his wonderful grasp of these abstruse problems, and his marvellous sense and sanity. We have been long accustomed to look upon Martin Luther as a great theologian, a magnetic leader in ecclesiastical reforms, and a stalwart champion of civil and religious liberty. But here he appears in a new light, or at least in one not so familiar to the world, or even to Lutherans themselves, as a master in political science and statecraft, and as the first advocate of social, educational and political reforms, the meaning and the importance of which the world at large is just beginning to appreciate, and not a few of which are being put forth to-day as new inventions or doctrines.

Ex-President Roosevelt would probably be surprised, as would many of his friends and supporters, to find that most of his so-called "policies," such as the encouragement of domestic industries, the control of monopolies in restraint of trade whether corporate or individual, the regulation of prices in the necessities of life, the prevention of extortion, the suppression of gambling, &c., were all propounded and vigorously defended by this German monk, centuries ago. We have here also the call for an elaborate system of public schools, and a demand for compulsory education, &c.

But we must forbear. We heartily commend this volume to the reading and study of Lutherans especially, but also of all who are interested in the general subject of political science.

The first chapter is an *Historical Introduction*, and the second a discussion of *The Germany of Luther's Day*, both of which add greatly to the value of the book. Besides the numerous foot

notes on nearly every page, there is a very full "Bibliography" at the close of the volume and an admirable "index," both of which are valuable additions.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE ARDEN PRESS. NEW YORK.

Problems of Your Generation. Pp. 104. Price \$1.00 postpaid.

This is a strange book. The author seems to be a "Daisy Dewey." Or, rather, we should say she is the transmitter. At least this is what the legend on the title page would seem to mean, "The author claims but to have been privileged to transmit the following chapters." It is claimed that the contents of the book are "a revelation," but from whom the revelation comes, or how it comes, is not made clear. The idea seems to be that it is a revelation from the spirits of those who once lived on the earth to those who are now living here to help them to seek and attain a higher soul-life. If this be the case we must say that until these spirits learn to use plainer terms, and to present their ideas in language more easily comprehensible by ordinary mortals, they might as well keep their "revelation" to themselves, so far as any good that it is likely to do is concerned.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

F. M. BARTON CO. CLEVELAND, OHIO.

National Perils and Hopes. By Wilbur F. Crafts, Ph.D. Pp. 152.

Dr. Crafts is widely known as one of the most active, fearless and successful reformers in the country. His specialties have been Sabbath observance and temperance. But there is no good cause, no movement which looks to social improvement, which does not have his sympathy.

This small volume has a sub-title which reads thus: "A Study Based on Current Statistics and the Observations of a Cheerful Reformer." It is made up of an address delivered before several reform associations last year, and now published, "with additions." It is a ringing indictment of the evils which curse society, and a no less ringing call to all good men and women to help to suppress them.

While there is no mincing of words in describing the evils of "the consumption of liquors, murders, divorces, lynchings, labor riots, municipal corruption, Sabbath desecration, impure shows, yellow journalism, brutal sports, judicial maladministration, graft and general lawlessness," there is no pessimism in the discussion. While the author sees clearly our "national perils," and wants to make all other good citizens see them, he also has

"hopes" of their suppression, and he tries to present them with equal clearness and force. As he himself writes in the preface, "It takes the blackest black to paint faithfully the perils of the hour, and the whitest white to paint the hopes." Dr. Crafts uses both the black and white paint liberally.

It is a stirring book and deserves careful reading and study by all good citizens who are seeking the welfare of their community and of society.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE NEW ENGLAND NEWS CO. BOSTON.

World Corporation. By King Camp Gillette, Discoverer of the Principles and Inventor of the System of "World Corporation." 9 x 6 in., pp. 240. Price \$1.00.

The author of this book thinks that he has found a cure for all the ills of society. It is what he calls "World Corporation," of which he is the inventor, or discoverer. He not only believes in the large corporations but he would encourage them to grow larger and larger, until his dream of "World Corporation" shall be realized. What this dream is is indicated by the following quotation from his "Declaration of Principles:" "I believe in the corporate acquisition and final ownership of all property and control of all industry by the people."

So sanguine is the author of the success of this scheme that he prophesies that within two years fifty billion of shares at one dollar each will be issued. As these are to be distributed among all nations, war will become impossible, disarmament will soon follow, and justice and plenty will everywhere abound.

Can it be that the author is serious in all this, and much more of the same kind, or do we simply have here a new "Utopia," or social and financial romance?

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

METROPOLITAN CHURCH ASSOCIATION. WAUKESHA, WIS.

Catacombs of Worldly Success, or History of Coarseller Dell.

By F. M. Messenger. Pp. 235.

This book is well named. It is a succession of horrors. It reminds one of the "chambers of imagery" shown to the prophet Ezekiel in Jerusalem.

The writer may be sincere, and his story may be founded on facts, as he claims. But we doubt the wisdom, or the benefit, of dragging all the decaying flesh and mouldy skeletons out of our social "catacombs" and parading them before the public. As the book is but little more attractive in its literary form and mechanical make-up, than in its contents, it is not likely to have many readers.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

